DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 188 PS 008 147

TITLE	Building Day Care Models for the South: Report of the Southeastern Day Care Project.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Donner (William H.) Foundation.; Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 75
NOTE	67p
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Cognitive Development; Community Resources; Community Role; *Day Care Programs; *Elementary Education; Emotional Development; Health Services; *Low Income; Motor Development; Parent Child Relationship; Parent Participation; *Preschool Education; Self Care Skills; Social Development; *State Program

ABSTRACT:

This report describes and evaluates a system of day care for 659 children in seven southern states (75 percent of the children were preschoolers and infants in center programs, 12 percent were preschoolers in family day care homes, and 13 percent were school-age children, primarily in center programs). Most of the families serves were low-income. Assessments of cognitive, social, emotional, motor, and hygiene/self-help development were obtained regularly for most of the children by observing their behavior on a series of developmental tasks. The programs in the system focused on maximizing children's total growth and development, increasing the involvement of the family and community, and providing families with supportive services. Parents were encouraged to help plan programs and become participants on advisory boards. Day care staff members were either inservice trained or had completed a two-year college curriculum. Included is a discussion of the project proposal for each of the seven states' demonstration day care projects, an account of how each project was implemented, and project goals and accomplishments. (BRT)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED114188

BUILDING DAY CARE MODELS FOR THE SOUTH

REPORT OF THE SOUTHEASTERN DAY CARE PROJECT

February, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Sponsored by

THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD
130 Sixth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Supported by funds from

THE WILLIAM H. DONNER FOUNDATION

and

TITLE IV-A
Social and Rehabilitation Services
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

PS 008 147

CONTENTS

FOREWORD. i

PART I
THE SOUTHEASTERN DAY CARE PROJECT: PHILOSOPHIES AND OBJECTIVES 1

Project Origins. 1

Project Design and Objectives. 2

States' Plans. 2

Philosophy of the Project. 3

Evaluation 6

Cost of Day Care 6

Community Involvement. 7

PART II
ISSUES IN DAY CARE: FINDINGS OF THE SOUTHEASTERN DAY CARE PROJECT 9

Who Was Served 9

Childrens' Progress on Developmental Objectives. 9

Infant Progress. 11

School Age Experience. 13

Health and Social Services 14

Length of Enrollment 16

Meeting the Family's Needs 16

Progress on Family Problems. 18

Parent-Child Relationships 19

Life-styles. 19

Involving Parents in Day Care. 21

Community Understanding of Day Care. 22

Delivering Publicly-Funded Day Care. 23

Staffing Day Care. 24

The Location and Setting of Day Care 25

How Much Does Day Care Cost? 28

PART III
OVERALL ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS OF THE PROJECT 31

Consortium Meetings. 31

Workshops for Day Care Program Directors and Staff. 32

Consultation Visits. 32

Studies and Reports. 32

Training Activities. 33

Major Publications 33

Results in the States. 34

Staff Reports. 34

PART IV
THE STATES' REPORTS 39

Alabama's Day Care Project 39

Florida's Day Care Project 40

Georgia's Day Care Project 41

Kentucky's Mobile Day Care Project 42

Mississippi's Day Care Project 46

North Carolina's Day Care Project. 48

South Carolina's Day Care Project. 52

Tennessee's Day Care Project 56

Appendix. 63

TABLES

I PERFORMANCE IN COGNITIVE AREA AT LAST RATING. 10

II PURPOSE FOR SEEKING DAY CARE AND SUCCESS IN MEETING PURPOSE 18

III FAMILY DAY CARE PLANS OF THE SDCP BY STATES 25

IV FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES 27

V COSTS OF DAY CARE 30

FOREWORD

In 1970 the Southern Regional Education Board undertook the role of coordinating and developing the evaluation and training components of the Southeastern Day Care Project. This was a collaborative effort of the William H. Donner Foundation, the eight Southeastern state child welfare agencies, the regional offices of the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the Office of Child Development, along with SREB. It was a three-year demonstration project to help the states develop their guidelines and procedures for state supported child day care for families that are recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

This is an overall report of that project including its activities and its results. The Southeastern Day Care Project produced several other publications which provided much greater detail regarding many aspects of the project.

We are grateful for the financial support of the Donner Foundation and the Social and Rehabilitation Service. We particularly wish to thank the many persons from the states who assisted in this project as well as staff from the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the Office of Child Development in the Region IV office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We are also especially indebted to the persons who worked on the staff of this project over the three-and-a-half years of its existence. The names of these persons are listed in the Appendix.

Harold L. McPheeters, M.D.
Director, Commission on Mental
Illness and Retardation
Southern Regional Education Board

00007

PART I

THE SOUTHEASTERN DAY CARE PROJECT: PHILOSOPHIES AND OBJECTIVES

Project Origins

In 1969 the William H. Donner Foundation chose a propitious time to begin a demonstration project in how to provide quality day care, because in 1969 a number of factors were coinciding which created a rich climate for such a project.

First was the concern of the Donner Foundation's staff and board about the problems of finding quality day care for children. They took their concern to Mr. Jule Sugarman, then acting director of the U.S. Office of Education, who along with others in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was aware of plans for a rapid expansion of publicly funded day care for poor families and of the need for the states to be ready with experience, policies and procedures when the expansion came.

It was also about this time that private money was beginning to be used as matching funds to get federal funds under the 1969 provision of Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. The Donner Foundation funds could be well used as matching money to conduct demonstration projects that would help the states get the needed experience in providing day care for families served by Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

It also happend that at that time, the Southeastern states[1] (Region IV of the DHEW) had had little experience in using public funds for day care, and they needed an opportunity to develop policies and procedures in anticipation of the coming expansion of publicly funded day care programs. After discussions with the child welfare directors of the Region IV states, this region was chosen as the place to carry out a three-year demonstration program in day care.

The Donner Foundation gave funds equally to each of the eight state welfare departments, who put up this money as the local share for 75 percent matching funds from the Title IV-A program. A coordinating agency was needed to administer and coordinate the project, and Donner asked the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)[2] to assume this role. SREB's efforts in coordination, training and evaluation were supported by individual contracts with each of the state welfare departments. Thus, planning was begun for the jointly funded Southeastern Day Care Project (SDCP).

---

[1] *The eight Southeastern states are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee.*

[2] *The Southern Regional Education Board is an interstate compact of 14 Southern states concerned mainly with facilitating higher education through regional action. The Mental Health Program of the SREB has a special interest in human service programs such as day care, and agreed to be coordinator of the project. The eight states participating in the SDCP are also member states of the SREB compact.*

Project Design and Objectives

A Southeastern Day Care Project Consortium was formed and asked to develop detailed plans, philosophies and objectives for the project. The Consortium was made up of representatives of the regional offices of child development, the Social and Rehabilitation Service (which administers Title IV-A funds), and representatives from each state's welfare commissioner (usually the director of the state's division of children's services). Project staff members from SREB also attended the meetings of the Consortium.

The major objectives of the project were:

1. To provide demonstrations of quality child day care in the states
2. To provide the states with experience in developing and operating public programs for day care under the Title IV-A program
3. To develop training mechanisms for day care personnel
4. To develop evaluation procedures for day care programs
5. To disseminate the findings to other states and interested persons.

States' Plans

The state project proposals were submitted as Section 115 grants which required that projects be innovative demonstrations that might be replicated in other parts of the states. Thus, there was an expectation that the projects would be creative and that they would provide experiences for the states in the development of additional day care programs. Each state developed its program in accordance with what it saw to be its own needs:

Alabama: Alabama contracted with the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa to experiment with group day care infants. There was a need for such a service, and the state had new licensing standards for infant care which needed to be tested. The program was used for academic teaching and research as well as for providing direct infant day care services.

Georgia: Georgia had already decided that the state would not directly operate day care programs, and contracted with a private-for-profit organization, Family Learning Centers, Inc., to provide a comprehensive day care program for a specific inner-city area of Atlanta.

Kentucky: Kentucky felt that its greatest need was to educate people throughout the state about day care and to improve existing day care through training. The state also stressed educating local social service workers about the potential of day care not only as a service for working mothers but as a child welfare resource. Their program consisted of a mobile demonstration van and a team of educators who traveled throughout the state.

00003

Mississippi: Mississippi developed a state-operated day care program for infants and preschoolers at Columbus, Mississippi. This was expected to be a demonstration for the rest of the state.

North Carolina: North Carolina had a somewhat different need from the other states. The state already had demonstration programs and money for the purchase or direct operation of day care for children for whom the state had responsibility, but facilities that met the standards for purchase were not available. Therefore the state decided to develop a concentrated delivery system in two counties, one urban (Cumberland) and one rural (Union), as demonstrations for other counties, with a particular focus on a training program which would assist other counties in the organization and delivery of services. The state had hoped to use project funds in the two demonstration counties to make grants to selected facilities, but under the contractual arrangements, this was not possible. Instead, the two counties were permitted to use the funds to purchase equipment, furnishings, enrichment materials and supplies for these facilities in exchange for 50 percent of the facilities' spaces being made available to the state for purchase.

A comprehensive system was to include a variety of nonprofit facilities such as day care centers, small group homes, family day care homes, and individual child care arrangements. Efforts would be made to serve infants to 14-year-olds, and also children with special needs. Each county was to develop a training site, and out of these experiences a training program would be developed for statewide use.

South Carolina: South Carolina took over an existing program that had been inadequately funded by a local group in a public housing project in Columbia. A year and a half later the project expanded to encompass another existing program which was located first in a deprived housing area and later in a private housing project. The program provided group and family day care services and social work and homemaker services to families in the local housing projects.

Tennessee: Tennessee developed a demonstration day care program in cooperation with the Belmont United Methodist Church in Nashville which made space and utilities available. Since the goal was to serve all day care needs of the families, the program provided center care for preschool and school age children, with satellite family day care homes for children under three years of age.

Philosophy of the Project

In the early stages of the project, a search of the literature and discussions with day care experts revealed that there are many different approaches and philosophies of day care. Some see day care as a custodial or babysitting service, and others see it as an opportunity to compensate for cognitive deficits in the children of the poor. There is also considerable difference in the ways in which the role of the family in day

00010

care is seen. The major emphasis in day care seems to be on the two-to-five-year-old child, with very little being done for infants and school age children. There is considerable emphasis on group day care, but very little systematic effort to look at family day care.

After many meetings and staff discussions with specialists in child development, the state directors of child welfare services, and prospective family users of day care, the following philosophies and objectives of the Southeastern Day Care Project were established:

Day care might be provided through centers, family homes, or after-school centers. It might serve children from infancy through 13 years of age. It might be provided by state operated programs or by private groups or agencies through a contract arrangement. Regardless of the method of delivery, day care in all of the projects was encouraged to have the following objectives:

1. Day care is concerned with the child's total growth and development. It should promote physical development, help the child to develop social competence in relating to adults and peers, encourage emotional growth and control, and provide opportunity for the cognitive learnings which are so crucial during the early years. All of these aspects of the child's development need to be carefully planned for and periodically assessed.

2. Day care attempts to make children more attractive and appealing to their families and friends by developing their social skills (manners, consideration for others, cooperation), their psychological skills (expressiveness, self-sufficiency, maleness or femaleness), their physical skills (running, climbing) and their learning skills (words, ideas, colors,numbers, problem-solving).

3. Day care is a basic support to the family. It should enhance and expand the parent's relationship to the child; it should not substitute, compete with, or disparage the role of parents. This philosophy is to be understood and shared with all members of the staff. Staff training sensitizes individuals to the dangers of unconsciously undermining the parental role and provides positive techniques for enhancing it.

4. Day care attempts to make families more effective by assisting and encouraging them: a) to correct any significant physical problems in their children; b) to provide a good balanced diet; c) to take advantage of preventive health measures, and d) to reinforce the development of social skills, physical skills and learning skills while the child is at home. Staff consults with and helps parents to correct behavior problems and inappropriate habits in their children. Day care also helps find resources in the community for meeting other needs and problems families face (e.g., housing, money, employment, health, education, marital problems) and helps families make use of these resources.

00011

5. Day care programs involve families in making decisions to as great a degree as possible in regard to hours of operation, intake policy, educational objectives, health and social services, fees charged, staffing, etc.

6. Day care programs are community resources and as such try to keep alert and sensitive to community needs and problems.

7. Day care programs make use of existing resources in the community and become, themselves, a part of the community's range of services to children and families.

Other characteristics seen as desirable in the provision of day care were:

1. Wherever possible, a day care program meets all of the day care needs of a family so that parents do not have to relate to several different agencies.

2. Day care is neighborhood oriented and, if possible, is within walking distance of the majority of families.

3. Wherever possible, children are not segregated according to racial or socioeconomic groupings.

4. Staffs are representative of the children served, and where possible, parents and other neighborhood people are given an opportunity for employment in the day care programs. Men as well as women are included as staff members.

The extent to which these characteristics were incorporated into the SDCP was limited by practical considerations such as the availability of space, licensing regulations (especially as they related to family day care homes), and the federal eligibility regulations, which became increasingly stringent as the project progressed.

Within this overall philosophy, it was necessary to set specific objectives against which programs could be evaluated. The objectives fell into three general groupings:

1. **Objectives for children:** including items related to physical growth, social interactions with other children and adults, personality characteristics, cognitive development, the development of self-help and hygiene skills.

2. **Objectives for families:** including childrearing practices and total family functioning.

3. **Objectives for communities:** as they relate to the day care programs and as they provide services to the centers and the families involved.

00012

These objectives are described in greater detail in a publication entitled ***The Southeastern Day Care Project: Its Philosophy and Objectives,*** and in ***Day Care Is...***, both published by the SDCP and available from the Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313.

Evaluation

After defining the philosophy and objectives of the SDCP, staff and consultants made decisions about how the project was to be evaluated, and developed procedures for evaluating the extent to which the objectives were met.

In assessing children's progress, especially in the cognitive area, standardized tests have been most commonly used. These involve a considerable expense for the purchase of the test instruments and for specially trained personnel to administer and score them. While the project had adequate funds to do this, SDCP felt that most existing tests are not really standardized for the particular group of children it was serving. Therefore, it chose to develop a behavioral rating scale made up of items in the area of cognitive, motor, social and emotional development, and self-help skills. Each of these items had been previously standardized for the various age groups. This kind of behavioral scale had a number of advantages: it did not require that young children be subjected to testing situations with strangers; it could be done by staff who are regularly with the children and who are very familiar with thair stages of development. It also provided immediate feedback to the staff for planning for individual children, for developing curricula that would promote knowledge and skills— in which a number of the children were weak—and identified areas where additional in-service training was needed for the staff. This rating scale is discussed in detail in an SDCP publication entitled ***Evaluating Children's Progress: A Rating Scale for Children in Day Care.*** Methods used by SDCP staff in analyzing the data are described in two additional SDCP bulletins, "Southeastern Day Care Project Rating Forms," and "Infant Progress on Developmental Objectives."

Additional data on the children and data on the objectives for families were drawn from the social histories, application forms and health records.

Cost of Day Care

Cost is another area in which there is relatively little hard data, and much of what is available is not comparable. There is usually no way of knowing whether the cost figures include rent or whether space is donated; whether the program in question operates six hours or is open 12 hours a day; it is not known whether start-up costs have been included or just regular operating costs. A cost analysis system was developed which categorizes expenditures and suggests classifications for different kinds of supplies, equipment, etc. This is described in an SDCP bulletin, "A Cost Analysis System for Day Care Programs."

00013

Community Involvement

Community involvement was measured by keeping careful records of contacts, community meetings, attendance at parent meetings, visitors to the centers and referral logs. Part II of this report presents some of the overall findings and recommendations of the SDCP. These are reported in much greater detail in the comprehensive publication, ***Evaluation Findings of the Southeastern Day Care Project,*** which was published by SREB in 1974.

00014

PART II

ISSUES IN DAY CARE: FINDINGS OF THE SOUTHEASTERN DAY-CARE PROJECT

This section summarizes the evaluation findings regarding the children and families served in the demonstration day care programs of the SDCP and the costs and administrative issues that were considered by the evaluation team.

Who Was Served

During the three years of the Project (1970-1973) 659 children, representing 424 families, were enrolled in the day care programs in seven states. (Kentucky had a mobile demonstration unit with no children actually enrolled in SDCP programs.) Three-fourths were preschoolers in center programs, and 12 percent were preschoolers in family day care homes. The rest were school age children, primarily cared for in center programs.

Each program except Florida served infants and toddlers. In some programs these young children were cared for in centers; in others they were cared for in family day care homes. North Carolina also served some infants in small group homes and in individual child care arrangements.

Since this was a Title IV-A project, most of the families served were low income. Over half, as a matter of fact, were families living in poverty, and 46 percent were welfare recipients. Many of the families were headed by women.

Although the project sought to promote an ethnic and socioeconomic mix among the children served, it was difficult to do so under eligibility constraints. Where eligibility was defined on a neighborhood basis, the enrollees were almost all black. (Seventy-seven percent of all children served were black.) The stricter 1973 federal regulations on eligibility eliminated some of the mix the programs had been able to achieve in the earlier stages of the project.

Some families paid fees based on income, ranging from a few dollars to $20 per week. Nominal fees were considered appropriate by several programs. Fee policies were more readily accepted when parents or advisory committees had an input into preparing them, including some control over when they might be waived.

Childrens' Progress on Developmental Objectives

The development of the children in the SDCP centers was monitored by regular ratings on forms planned for this purpose. The items of the scale were selected by the SDCP staff from known standards of normal development for children. The success or failure of an item was considered important to a child's development, but it was not turned into a score or label that might be misinterpreted.

The ratings were used to measure each child's progress toward meeting the SDCP objectives of healthy and normal child development. Staff rated

the children at planned intervals to evaluate progress and to provide child care staff with information about each child's progress. This information served as a basis for planning programs for individual children and as a basis for overall curriculum development.

Each rating form covered the cognitive, social, emotional, motor and hygiene/self-help areas. Development in each was assessed by observing the child's behavior on a series of developmental tasks. For example, in the cognitive area, an item for a four-to-five-year-old was "Draws human figure with head, body, arms and legs." A social item for the same age group was "Seeks a child to play with." Examples of motor and hygiene/self-help tasks were "Hops on one foot, then the other, in continuous movement from place to place, " and "Will try new foods when served." For the younger ages, the items were appropriately geared to the age being rated.

Shortly after admission to the program each child was rated on the form appropriate to his age. A total of 450 preschoolers were rated upon entry. Included were 112 two-year-olds, 150 three-year-olds, and 188 four- and five-year-olds. Three hundred and fifty-four children were in the program long enough to have at least two ratings. Of these children, 35 were two years old at the time of their last rating; 63 were three, and 256 were four or five.

Outcomes on the ratings showed that the children performed well in the motor, self-help and social-emotional areas. The outcomes in these areas for all three age groups showed fast rates of development. For two-year-olds, these areas showed large gains from first to last rating. For example, almost twice as many two-year-olds succeeded on all motor items at the last rating as had on the first. By contrast, three- and four- and five-year-olds often had succeeded so well on their initial ratings that only moderate change was possible by the time of the last rating.

These findings suggest that these children showed fast early development in the motor, self-help and social-emotional areas. These areas may need less specific intervention by day care programs.

The cognitive area does not show this same pattern of early development. The items in this section were less apt to be achieved at first rating and therefore served as useful discriminators throughout the period of enrollment. At the time of last rating, outcomes in the cognitive area were still very much spread across the span from little to great success.

TABLE I

PERFORMANCE IN COGNITIVE AREA AT LAST RATING

	Children rated	0-4 items	5-8 items	9 items	10 items
Two-year-olds	34	3%	50%	24%	24%
	Children rated	**0-3 items**	**4-5 items**	**6-7 items**	**9 items**
Three-year-olds	62	13%	15%	36%	37%

	Children rated	0-10 items	11-13 items	14-16 items	17-18 items	19 items	20 items
Four-and five-year-olds	256	14%	16%	27%	23%	13%	7%

00016

The greater difficulty which cognitive items presented to these children relative to other areas has several implications. It may indicate that the cognitive items were more precisely stated than the items in the other areas. The less precise wording of the noncognitive items may have permitted greater leeway for the rater and thus there was greater likelihood that success could be achieved on an item. For example, a rater may have felt more secure in rating "yes" to "Child relates positively to adults—asks for help, asks for approval, but is not overly dependent," than in rating "yes" to "Knows address—can give street and number correctly." If wording had been equally exact on items of all areas, perhaps success rates would have been more equal in all areas, too.

On the other hand, cognitive skills may have been more sensitive than social-emotional, motor or self-help skills in identifying differences among these children. If this is true, the difference in results in the cognitive area may be indicative of a fairly wide range of development or maturity among the children in the SDCP. The items chosen for each area, including the cognitive ones, incorporate basic standard objectives expected in normal child development patterns. Thus, a child's failure to master these basic skills must be taken seriously.

The children were rated at the time of their enrollment in the program and at the end of the project to assess their development over time. The cognitive objectives were definitely not met for 14 percent of the four- and five-year-olds, and were not met to the desired extent for an additional 16 percent of this age group. While the average age of the group may fall within the period covered by the rating forms, these are still large percentages. This varying success rate may be a warning signal of impending learning problems as the children enter school.

Day care was well able to meet individual needs in social-emotional, motor and self-help areas. In cognitive growth, though, the day care program seemed unable to keep all the preschoolers progressing according to the standards expected for the appropriate ages. The SDCP experience does not provide encouragement that intervention in the cognitive area can overcome social and economic deprivations sufficiently to have most poverty area children achieve the desired norms. Although there is no doubt that day care helped some of the children in the programs to be better prepared for cognitive achievement than if they had not been enrolled, there is no assurance that day care is able to eliminate the gap that some children will bring with them to begin their school careers.

Infant Progress

Six of the day care programs cared for infants as well as for older preschoolers. In Alabama, the center program initially served only infants. In Georgia, several infants were cared for in a family day care home, and later in the center. In Tennessee and South Carolina, infants were cared for in family day care homes. Mississippi and North Carolina served infants in the center along with older preschoolers.

The original statement of the SDCP objective for infants was "that the development of infants should not be negatively affected by day care,

that these infants be able to develop within accepted ranges for motor (fine and gross), language and personal social skills." The objective was later refined to include all the major areas of child development. The SDCP developed rating forms consisting of basic items that describe normal child growth and development patterns. The form for rating infants was developed by combining activities set out and tested on traditional infant development instruments.[3]

The rating form contained 54 tasks grouped in 10 age periods. The periods covered the months from birth to two and one-half years. The form was completed by observing the child and assessing what his usual capability is at each time sequence. Therefore, odd instances of success or failure should not color the picture of development. Ratings were scheduled regularly, beginning soon after enrollment and then at six-week intervals. Frequent rerating is important since development is rapid in the first two years.

The course of development of many infants was assessed during the three years of SDCP operation. Seventy-three children had two or more ratings, so progress could be evaluated over a period of time. These children were cared for in six SDCP centers or family day care homes. In considering the children's growth, the course of development as well as performance at the last rating must be assessed. Children whose development seems slow at first or children whose development is adequate at the first rating, but then tapers off during enrollment, may have developmental problems.[4]

Of the 73 children rated, 22 completed all items for their age period at each point they were rated. An additional 30 children missed some items at the first rating, but by the last ratings, all these children were completing all items. Thus, these children, though perhaps having initial problems, had made satisfactory progress.

Outcomes for the remaining 21 children were less positive. Nine children completed all expected tasks when first rated, but were somewhat behind by the last rating. The remaining 12 children at no time completed all items for their ages. A methodological problem in evaluating the ratings, though, introduces some leeway in assessing the children's progress. A child may be rated on a group of items when he is still within the age period rather than at the older limit of it. He may miss some of those items, but is not expected to achieve them until he has reached the top of the age bracket. In this case, judgment must be reserved as to whether his progress is adequate. After eliminating children whose ratings occur before they reach the top of the age bracket, only 15 of those 21 children seemed behind. So, in all, 20 percent of the infants can be said to be at least one month behind in development.

---

[3]Instruments used were ***Bayley Scales of Infant Development, Denver Developmental Screening Test, Gesell Developmental Schedules,*** and ***Vineland Social Maturity Scale.***

[4]For a fuller description of infant development and the methods of analysis, see "Infant Progress on Developmental Objectives," SDCP bulletin No. 9.

00018

Satisfactory progress by the full group of children on the infant rating was sustained as the children turned two years old. Twenty-six children turned two while they were enrolled. The average age of these children at their first two-year rating was 25 months. The children were not expected to complete two-year items until the end of the period, yet at their earliest ratings, the children successfully completed an average of 7 to 10 items in the cognitive section. This performance is similar to that found on the first ratings of children who were already two years old at enrollment. Thus, for the bulk of children, infant day care does not seem to impede cognitive development as some observers have feared.

But the outcomes on the infant ratings are not completely reassuring as to the effect day care may have on infant development. Last ratings showed satisfactory progress for 58 of the 73 children. The remaining 15 children were behind at the time of the last rating. Of these, one child was clearly developing slowly, but this child was felt to be mentally retarded. Although these 15 children were fully successful on ratings at some time during the period, by the end of enrollment they were lagging. The group constitutes 19 percent of the infants enrolled. Thus, outcomes on a scale designed to measure achievement of fundamental stages of early child development do not remove doubts as to whether out-of-home care may be associated with inadequate development for some children.

Unfortunately there was no control group of children from similar backgrounds who were cared for in their homes. Thus it is impossible to ascertain whether day care rather than some other factor is the variable that correlates with slow progress.

School Age Experience

School age day care has a different character and a very different evaluation form from that of preschool children. The preschool evaluation form had the advantage of describing fundamental skills of early life in which indications of success at various stages were fairly well standardized. But children in school have already mastered the fundamental tasks of the preschool years and are autonomous individuals learning skills for school, where they spend many hours a day. Thus, the emphasis of the day care program was on social competence and personal adjustment, with only a little support and reinforcement for cognitive development, which is stressed by the school.

Therefore the items on the school age evaluation form covered social and personal functioning and focused on what a child "is like." But with its emphasis on personality attributes, the form does not lend itself to quantitative analysis. Success in social-emotional areas was less well standardized for children 6 to 13 than preschool achievement on basic skills, and there was no quantitative scale defining adjustment against which to rank the older child's adjustment.

The evaluation form did help, however, to focus staff's attention on areas where a child needed attention. The form described various behaviors such as "Child is helpful to younger children in the program,"

00019

or "Seeks adult help when needed," or "Has a positive self-concept." Staff indicated whether these behaviors were or were not typical for the child. This permitted attention to behaviors that were not typical, but made no judgment about the child's failure to show any particular behaviors.

The school age rating form is valuable to centers in planning activities to strengthen certain areas of development. Staff commented that the forms were useful in parent conferences since they enabled the parent and teacher to focus on specifics.

Health and Social Services

Health: Health and social services are very important elements of day care programs. These services were provided through different means and in varying degrees by the several programs in the project. Most programs provided health services not through their own funding, but through whatever community services they could find and use.

Most children in the SDCP programs had their immunization programs completed, probably because most state licensing regulations require certain shots to be given before a child can enter day care, or soon thereafter. Most children were also examined by a doctor.

The availability of community services varies by size of the community. In the large cities, public health clinics are available to give physical examinations and immunizations, and there are services in hospitals and agencies that provide free preventive care and treatment. The day care program located in Atlanta was very successful in using community health resources and was able to get health care for the entire family.

But health services can be a real problem in the smaller communities. Sparse public health clinic service and difficulty in finding private physicians meant that children often had to wait weeks before their physical examinations and immunizations could be completed. One program located in a small town solved the problem by employing a nurse as part of the center staff. In areas where a public health nurse could make periodic rounds to centers to give immunizations and services, it was not necessary to repeatedly transport groups of children to clinics.

A small portion of the children did not receive all of their shots or a doctor's physical examination. This was surprising since licensing regulations require the health exams. The incomplete examinations and shots resulted from various factors. Sometimes a test was not given or a shot not obtained because the parent did not follow through, and the day care staff did not have it done. Often a test or a shot was not given because it was not available in the health clinic or from a local physician.

The SDCP did not find, however, that its rural areas had higher rates of incomplete examinations. Mississippi and Alabama, where programs had the poorest community health resources, still managed to get health services, and did better than the average on most tests.

00920

Laboratory tests were the least likely to be obtained, but then perhaps it is not realistic to require routine urinalysis and blood examinations for children with no indications of problems.

The SDCP was quite successful in identifying abnormal health conditions and providing remedial treatment. About one-third of the children had some kind of medical or developmental problem. They ranged from speech and hearing problems to chronic impetigo and malnutrition, and included developmental, behavioral or emotional problems, and stuttering problems. Other problems were orthopedic needs, chronic infections, continuous colds and runny noses, anemia, hernia, ringworm and pinworm.

Of the 215 problems identified, 144 required center staff to locate and obtain the appropriate treatment or participate in the treatment by giving the child medicine, making sure a child kept on a bandage or eye patch, helping parents follow through on treatment, etc. More than 90 percent of the problems identified were treated through SDCP action or referral.

SDCP centers tried to be troubleshooters, to catch problems before they grew to full size. Dental, auditory and vision screenings were frequently available to children in the programs. At least 83 percent of the children were screened for dental problems, and of these, 13 percent had some sort of dental problem. For 17 percent there was no information; 70 percent had no problem. Dental treatment was obtained for half the children with dental problems. The SDCP experience suggests dental screenings are valuable in revealing dental problems at an early stage to prevent major dental work later.

Auditory and vision screenings were done less frequently. Less than one-fourth of the children had both screenings. Two centers, Florida and Georgia, were most successful in arranging the tests. Their urban locations may have facilitated their success.

Eighty-three children had behavioral or emotional problems. In 53 of the cases, day care resolved or lessened the problem. In some instances, though, the problem was out of the range of the staff, and special help was obtained.

Height and weight were not checked by program staff as had been anticipated. Growth is evident to the eyes of practiced staff members and actual measurements are necessary only when problems are evident.

An offshoot of good health services for the child in day care may mean better health for the other family members. Social workers tried to watch the health of other children in the family. Their assessment suggested that in 11 percent of the families, the other children's health improved. While this is a good result, a direct relationship between the family health improvement and enrollment of a child in day care cannot be drawn.

00021

Social Services: Social services were offered in various ways. Some programs had their own social workers, either full or part time. In one program the social worker was also designated as the official state welfare service worker for AFDC families in the center, which was an advantage to the families.

In other programs the social work component of the day care program was provided by a service worker in the public welfare office. Although this arrangement did not permit the social worker to have the same day-by-day exposure to the families as she would have had if located at the center, the quality of social work noted in the SDCP was not related to where the social worker was housed. Rather than location, the most important elements in the success of the social workers in the programs appeared to be the individual personalities and capabilities of the social workers themselves.

Length of Enrollment

Stability in day care is helpful to both mother and child. The longer the relationship between a family and a center, the more family problems were solved. Reality factors often intervened to end the relationship, however. It was severed in many cases because the children had outgrown the need for day care, but in other instances children were withdrawn because of transportation difficulties, moving out of the neighborhood, or the mother's loss of employment so that day care was no longer needed. Busing of school age children caused schedule disruptions in two centers, and meant that children arrived at the day care center too late to warrant continued participation in the program.

Meeting the Family's Needs

An important issue in the delivery of publicly funded day care involves who should be eligible for day care and, given limited resources, which families and children should have priority.

The SDCP was guided in its enrollment policies by several objectives. One was to meet family needs for day care to enable adults to work and improve their economic condition. Another was to meet total child care needs of any one family, so parents would not have to use different services for their other children. Also an effort was made to employ parents of enrolled children. An important objective was to seek an ethnic and cultural mix of children to enrich the experience of all. Overriding all of these objectives were the federal guidelines which delineate eligibility for social services under Title IV-A funding.

A mother who wishes to work and finds child care for one preschooler but not the other, or who must accept care for the two in different locations, obviously has not had her total child care needs conveniently met. And she has not been fully served if her seven-year-old returns from school to an empty house. The project had greater success in serving all of a family's preschoolers than all their school age children. Many efforts were made to accommodate younger children and to bend age limits

00022

for enrollments, but there were still families who had young children being cared for in different arrangements. This raises the question of whether day care programs designed to meet needs of only certain pre-school age groups are flexible enough to meet the total child care needs for a family. The federal day care requirements are presently very firm on age groupings.

The experience of the SDCP has some implications on the issue of enrollment policies and on the feasibility of the various enrollment objectives.

By the end of the child's enrollment (or by the end of the project) many parents were meeting the objective for which they had enrolled the child in day care. Over half of those who enrolled children so they could continue vocational training or high school had met their enrollment purpose. Two-thirds of the families who applied for day care did so because they wanted to continue working or wanted to find a job.

The majority of those who enrolled their children in order to continue employment were able to do so. The success rate for those seeking employment (61 percent) was not as good, and reflects the great difficulty a new entrant into the labor force has in finding and holding a job, as compared to the person who is already working. This finding is important for programs that have an objective of "employing all welfare mothers through the provision of day care."

Training for new skills is perhaps the most important instrument to help low income mothers out of poverty. Social workers in the SDCP encouraged mothers to take advantage of training opportunities, including WIN programs.

The progress of two groups of trainees was monitored during the course of the project. One group was persons (mostly mothers) who wanted to enter some kind of training program, and the other was those who were already in a training program when they enrolled their children in day care. Of the first group of 67, 23 actually enrolled in some program. One reason for the differences between those desiring training and those actually enrolling in training is that in some communities there are few training programs and there are waiting lists for the existing ones.

Of the adults already in training, plus those who entered training during the project, 27 percent completed the course and 17 percent obtained employment. Many reasons contributed to the attrition; pressures to go to work, inability to finish, lack of interest or commitment, or resistance in general to being required to enter training in order to obtain public assistance payments. Also, funds for some training programs were cut in midstream, and jobs were sometimes not available in the field for which the training was given.

One-third of the families served in the programs had increased their incomes by the end of their children's enrollment or by the end of the project. The proportion of those with increased incomes among poverty and non-poverty groups was practically the same.

00023

TABLE II

PURPOSE FOR SEEKING DAY CARE
AND SUCCESS IN MEETING PURPOSE

Purpose	Percent of all families	(Percent of Families with Specific Purpose) Purpose met	Purpose not met	Unknown
Enable female guardian to seek and take employment	22	61	32	7
Enable female guardian to continue employment	45	82	10	8
Enable female guardian to take vocational training	17	56	30	14
Meet needs of child not met at home	12	83	2	15
Continue college	0	82	9	9
Other reasons	3	0	0	100
No record	1	0	0	100
TOTAL		72	17	11

Progress on Family Problems

The SDCP had objectives for parents other than providing the best care for their children while parents worked or otherwise improved their economic status. The project also sought to aid parents by strengthening their relationships with their children, by assisting them to improve living patterns, and by facilitating their access to community resources. One of the primary functions of the social workers was to assist parents in solving their problems. Since a majority of the families had incomes below the poverty line, many family problems were related to lack of money. Poor housing, poor nutrition, life-styles that might interfere with children's development, and other characteristics of economically deprived families were considered to be within the purview of the total day care program. It was hoped the social workers could assist families to improve these conditions.

Social workers were encouraged to direct their efforts for families in a problem-oriented manner. They were asked to try to define separate problems that a family faces, and then aid the family in pursuing remedies and actions that would alleviate each problem. Careful review of the records prepared on these families revealed 634 problems for 424 families. The problems ranged across a vast scope—poor housing, an invalid father, lack of motivation, alcoholism, emotional instability, neglect of family planning, and marital stress and dispute. The most frequent response by social workers to these problems was referral to some agency that specializes in handling the problems or offers special services. Social workers also counseled and advised families and gave needed support by just plain caring.

The progress of each family was followed closely. Were problems any closer to solutions? Was all being done that might be done? Positive progress was noted for many families, with only a small proportion of problems (17 percent) apparently receiving no attention. Sometimes no action was taken in problem areas that are difficult to do anything about. For example, it is difficult to obtain positive results in problems of alcoholism. This was borne out by the project's experience. Surprisingly, family planning was also a problem about which nothing seemed to happen for many families, despite indication of a need for help.

Parent-Child Relationships

> *I used to tell my child, "I don't have time to listen to you now." I used to tell him, "Go sit down, I gotta fix this food now," or, "Leave that alone, boy. Get out of my hair." Now we all sit down and talk to each other. I learned you have to take the time to listen to your child.*

How does one measure the relationship between parent and child? By a hug and a kiss? By parent and child listening and talking to each other? By how parents discipline their child? By whether a child is usually clean or dirty?

The SDCP tried to watch indicators of parent-child relationships to determine whether day care is associated with changes in the ways parents interact with their children. Gains were noticed for a small group of parents. The low rates of gain may indicate that families were already interacting well with their children, or that subjective evaluations of changes in this area are difficult to come by. In many cases, the social workers simply made no notes on this item.

Life-styles

Helping families to improve their living patterns was probably the most far-reaching and difficult SDCP goal. This goal meant progress in homemaking skills, personal appearance of the mother, the kind of meals served at home, regularity of family life (eating meals together, or putting children to bed at approximately the same time every night),

00025

adequate sleeping arrangements for everyone in the family, toothbrushes that are used, and availability of picture books, catalogs and crayons in the house.

The notion that day care might have an effect on living patterns implies that a change in living patterns is sometimes desirable. Desiring such change may seem paternalistic; however, the objectives of the project were designed with the help of potential day care users, and it was they who insisted that the project help families to improve their living patterns.

The SDCP experience in this area is difficult to interpret. On the one hand many families seemed to have good life-styles to begin with, so that no improvement was necessary. On the other hand, it was difficult to obtain information about life-styles of many families. Social workers, who were the source of any available information in this area, may have known more than they wrote down, but the records are surprisingly barren of any information regarding life-styles. This was unexpected, because social work claims to have a primary concern for family life and the social well-being of families. However, the project findings do permit some tentative conclusions:

1. The success of social work efforts is related to the family's condition beforehand: some families are on the threshold of improving their lives while others are not. Where a mother already has motivation, the support of a concerned social worker may be just what is needed to bring about actual attempts to rise and progress. It is in these cases that the social work payoff was most often evident. Perhaps social work that measures its effectiveness only in positive change is destined to fail in some hard-core situations, no matter how consistent and strong the supportive efforts may be. A more realistic goal for these situations might be simply to keep the situation from becoming worse.

2. When case records were analyzed from the viewpoint of attention to the problems families face, the majority of problems received some type of action. A great number of positive actions were recorded.

3. The objective of enabling parents to work was met for many families. Two-thirds of the families who sought day care because they wished to go to work succeeded in finding jobs by the end of enrollment of their children.

4. Many families were encouraged to avail themselves of training programs. Social workers identified 67 adults who sought training, and assisted one-third who enrolled. Unfortunately the attrition rate for these trainees, as well as for others who were already in training when the children enrolled, was quite high.

5. Success in strengthening the relationships between parents and children is difficult to measure. The various indicators that the project monitored to measure this did not produce clear evidence one way or the other.

6. It is difficult to come to any conclusions about the effects of day care, and especially its social work component, on numerous living patterns—consumerism, regularity of eating and sleeping, availability of stimulating materials for children, etc. One of the hindrances in reaching any conclusion is the lack of information in the records about these areas. The high proportion of "no records" raises the question of how realistic it is to expect day care to have impact in these areas. Where information on various living styles is available in case records, only a small percentage of the families seem to have real problems in these areas. Relative to the small number of problems identified, the occasional changes or improvements noted appear more significant. Perhaps day care is able to leave a mark on the life-styles of families where problems are severe enough to substantially interfere with the development of the children.

Involving Parents in Day Care

If you are not interested enough to come to parent meetings once a month when you send your child every day of the week, you are not even interested in your child. --Mrs. Smith

If I am too tired to come to the center after working a full day, getting home on the bus, picking up my child, cooking and cleaning when I get home, that is not to say I am not interested in my child. The center is not helping me as a person by expecting me to come back then. They only make me feel guilty if I don't. --Mrs. Jones

Both views are valid and deserve the respect of day care staff in planning for parent involvement. The SDCP defined day care as a service to families as well as to their children. This philosophy made it imperative that there be a real commitment to parent involvement, with a wide spectrum of opportunities for communication between parents and staff. Organized parent groups, parents as part of a center's advisory group, all kinds of volunteer opportunities at times convenient to parents, and one-to-one communication between parents and staff when children arrive in the morning or leave in the afternoon—are all examples of involving parents in the day care program.

Parents were enlisted in the planning of the overall SDCP. Parents, who were representative of the groups to be served in the various communities, were included in establishing goals and objectives for the project.

Each program developed organized parent groups. Content of parent meetings ranged from social events to educational sessions on childrearing.. Sewing, crafts, preparing income tax returns and learning how to budget were subjects of various meetings.

00027

Advisory boards, with parents as participants, were slower to be organized than parent groups. Some centers were still struggling with developing strong advisory boards at the end of three years, while others had good success in establishing and using them as liaison groups with the community.

Parent involvement is a two-way street. It depends upon the staff extending a broad variety of opportunities for parents to be involved. It also depends on parent commitment to holding up their end of the responsibility. Evaluation of commitment was based on the extent to which parents followed through on previously agreed-upon arrangements. Did they bring and pick up the child, or have him ready for the bus on time? Were medical exams obtained as agreed on, and did parents come to conferences? Did children attend regularly? Did parents attend parent meetings?

The experience of the SDCP is that over half of the parents will come to one or two meetings, but only 10 to 15 percent will form the core of the parent group and attend regularly. Most parents followed through on conferences when scheduled. Most parents followed through on responsibility of obtaining health exams, on transportation arrangements, and on getting the child to the center when he was well. Only 5 to 10 percent of the parents fell short of these expectations.

Community Understanding of Day Care

The SDCP centers served as important outreach agents. They interpreted day care to the community by making presentations to community groups, and opened the centers and facilities to streams of visitors from social services and licensing agencies and early childhood programs. They also acted as resources for workshops and training programs about child development or day care. Center activities also showed how interaction with educational institutions could satisfy mutual needs; specialized skills were offered by the schools, and the centers offered practical experience to students at all levels.

Programs in the SDCP also actively sought community resources to supplement budget, activities and manpower. SDCP programs had limited ability to pay for health services in the community and so developed local resources. Public health departments were used; volunteer services of doctors,dentists, and agencies for speech, hearing and vision problems were cultivated as well as university resources for psychological and other specialized clinical services. Local resources supplemented food budgets also. State and federal nutrition staff and surplus commodity foods and U.S. Department of Agriculture reimbursements enhanced the food services.

Program activities gained public exposure through use of community resources such as public libraries for special exhibitions. Local cultural groups and city recreation departments provided equipment and facilities which might not have been otherwise available.

00028

The use of such resources depends on the availability of the services in the community, and on the aggressiveness of the program director in finding and mobilizing services. Ingenuity, patience and perseverance by the staff are important in attracting a variety of services to the center. The strong efforts of all the SDCP programs to be involved in their communities contributed greatly to the "demonstration" value of these model programs.

Delivering Publicly-Funded Day Care

Delivery of publicly-funded day care involves many options and issues. An important issue concerns the method of delivering the service: Who should operate day care programs—the public agency itself? A third party through contract with the public agency? By purchasing slots in existing programs? The SDCP experience included all three options. Each had its advantages and disadvantages.

Public agency operated: This option encounters problems associated with state bureaucracy. Employment of day care personnel through the Merit system is cumbersome and time-consuming. Purchasing items for day care (from cribs to diapers) under the triple bid procedure is also cumbersome. But the administrative and management costs for SDCP programs operated directly by the public agency (either state or county) were relatively low.

Contracting for a program with a third party: These may be contracts with "for profit" or "nonprofit" groups. This option keeps the state out of the actual delivery system. Is this more efficient? The two SDCP "third-party programs" were no faster in gearing up for actual operation than the agency-operated ones. Their administration and management costs are much higher, 26 percent and 30 percent of operating costs, than the 11 to 16 percent for the agency-operated programs.

In writing contracts with a third party "for profit" sponsor, how is profit defined? Is it a guaranteed (cost-plus) percent of other costs, or does the sponsor assume the risk of making his profit? How does the funding agency determine that the service it is contracting for is actually being delivered?

Purchasing individual slots in existing programs: This option has the advantage of placing eligible children in ongoing programs, and thereby seeks to maintain an ethnic and cultural mix. In practice, however, the experience in North Carolina's purchase-of-care program still found that it is difficult to obtain such a mix, even by purchasing slots, especially when there is an attempt to use programs close to the child's own home.

This option also has the advantage of maintaining ongoing programs and supporting them through the payment for slots. This avoids competing with marginal private programs by establishing new agency-operated ones. This option has the built-in possibility of improving the ongoing programs in the community by offering assistance and training to centers from which many slots are purchased.

30029

Staffing Day Care

The fine line between who is "pretrained" and who is not is often difficult to draw. The SDCP made an arbitrary decision to classify all staff with two-year college degrees or more as "pretrained." The ratio of in-service trained staff to "pretrained" staff in direct child care in SDCP programs varied from 7/1 in one program to 0.3/1 in another. In one center the head teacher did not have a degree of any sort, but had many years of experience. Elsewhere, a local college turned out many two-year degree people who were only too glad to find jobs in day care, so that the center had an ample supply of pretrained staff.

The quality of the SDCP programs did not seem to relate to the number of pretrained persons on the staff. Neither did it seem to relate to the child/staff ratios. Excluding the all-infant program, the direct child/staff ratios (counting only those in direct child care) varied from 6.8/1 to 3.3/1. What did seem to make the difference in the quality of the programs was the ability of the director to inspire and mobilize the staff toward service. The support for the program at the agency level (state or county) also affected morale and quality.

Career opportunities are important to paraprofessionals. The SDCP found that opportunities definitely exist in day care, and many workers were promoted to higher positions in the SDCP programs as they gained experience and training. Several paraprofessionals were encouraged to take advantage of formal training in order to obtain credentials.

Although the project stressed employment of males, only 12 percent of the staff employees were male, and many of these served as janitors or drivers. Even these served as father or grandfather models. Overcoming traditional concepts of sex roles is not easy, but once a breakthrough occurs, more men become interested.

Another objective was to employ racially mixed staffs. Blacks constituted 23 percent of all pretrained staff and 69 percent of all in-service trained staff employed in the programs. One of the seven center directors was black. Several social workers and teachers were black.

Fourteen percent of all staff employed sometime during the programs were parents of enrolled children. The staff-parent role was watched carefully to see if it presented any serious problems. In the SDCP experience, it is a problem only when the child-parent relationship itself is uneasy. Then it becomes aggravated by the staff-parent role conflict. Otherwise there seem to be no drawbacks to employing parents as staff.

Staff turnover was also carefully monitored. Children in day care need continuity. How does day care provide it? The turnover rate for staff of the programs was 78 percent for pretrained staff and 61 percent for the in-service trained (separations over the three years as a percent of total positions). This is translated into an average yearly turnover rate of 26 percent for pretrained persons and 20 percent for in-service trained staff. The rate for in-service trained staff may result because

00030

day care jobs are an improvement over jobs they might otherwise have had. The promise of career opportunities also reduces the likelihood they will make changes. The somewhat higher rates for pretrained staff may mirror the fact that many are wives of "mobile" husbands.

The Location and Setting of Day Care

Family day care: The SDCP put great emphasis on concurrent demonstration of both center care and family day home care. Family day care is an important service for a variety of reasons. It is more like traditional care in the child's own home. Too, infants can be cared for in homes in those states which prohibit infant care in centers. Family day care mothers are fully employed in an activity which allows them important self-expression. Historically, the most frequent arrangements working mothers have made for their children have been in the child's own home or in the home of a neighbor.

The SDCP demonstrated the operation of family day care in conjunction with center care, with resources available on a system-wide basis to serve both the homes and the centers. These resources are administrative services, social services, training, purchasing, program enrichment, and parent organization.

Five states had originally planned to develop family day care homes as part of their demonstrations. Although each of these states did develop homes, some fell below their stated objectives in the number of family day care homes to be set up and in the number of children to be served in them. During the project period, 12 percent of the children were in family day care.

TABLE III

FAMILY DAY CARE PLANS OF THE SDCP BY STATES

		Results on Family Day Care	
Original Plans	Age Groups	No. of FDC Homes	No. of Children Served in FDC During SDCP
Ga. 2 homes	infants	1 for only six months	3
Ky.* 10 homes	all ages	no record	no record
N.C.* 4 homes		5	no record
S.C. 5 homes	all ages	2	17
Tenn. 5 homes	infants and toddlers	5	55

*Not to be funded by the project, but to be encouraged and/or subsidized by the project.

09031

State programs faced many barriers as they tried to develop family day care homes. Two important ones were recruitment of home operators and fees. Little response followed notices about family day care opportunities sent out by the Georgia program. In South Carolina, fees ($12.50 per week per child) depended on the child being present all week. This may have deterred prospective family day care operators. Some additional incentive was created when fees were guaranteed even if a child missed a day or so a week. Tennessee dealt with the low fee problem by paying women an overall retainer of $25 as well as the $12.50 per week per child. Even the fee of $12.50 per child would net women higher weekly incomes if the full complement of children could be assured. However, the low fees remained a problem in all states.

The logistics of matching children to family day care homes are often complicated. Regulations that prohibit placement of more than two or three children under age two or three in a single home, transportation to the home, and the location of prospective children relative to the home, all created problems which often resulted in family day care mothers having vacancies in their programs.

The larger the system of family day care homes, the greater the possibilities of overcoming these problems. There are definite advantages to operating a system of family day care homes as if it were an extended day care center.

Licensing requirements created serious impediments to the development of family day care in the project states. Unrealistic health or fire safety code requirements relating to such items as vinyl covers and vented stoves (often designed for larger institutional settings) and inflexible standards relating to fencing, use of basements, upstairs areas, and the household's beds, made it impossible to set up family day homes in many public housing projects and poverty areas where they were most needed.

After considering the problems of licensing family day care homes, the SDCP suggested that registration of family day care homes might be more appropriate. Such a system would require women who were providing family day care to register with the local agency. Through this registry, a census of providers would be formed for agency outreach and for women needing day care. The staff of the agency that registers homes would be able to offer training and technical assistance for the provision of good day care. Thus the legal licensing process would not be involved in family day care, but there would be supervision and assistance to assure quality care.

Family day care workers: The family day care workers were all women—11 black, one white. The education level ranged from third grade to some college. Their ages ranged from 29 to 58 years old and averaged 42 years of age. Seven kept their own children in the home.

Of the 12 family day care mothers employed in the program, 7 were still employed at the end of the project. The average length of employment for family day care mothers was 17.1 months, and 15.4 months for paraprofessional center staff. The turnover rates for family day care

00032

workers in the SDCP were comparable to those found for paraprofessionals in center care, so that on the average there seems to be no more instability with adult relationships for children in family day care than in center care.

Family day care costs: Family day care costs compare favorably to center costs. Organizing day care in a home may require lower start-up costs and may perhaps be more economical to operate. Infant care and night care cost no more than preschool care when provided in the family day care setting. In centers, these specialized demands may cause costs to soar. Another benefit is the favorable adult/child ratio. Family day care approaches the pattern of care the child would receive in his own home, without putting costs out of reach. A cost liability, though, is the problem that licensing of family day care homes is more costly to the licensing agency.

Actual family day care costs in the SDCP are shown in Table IV. Certain "overhead" program costs for administration, social services and any other functions that apply equally to children in centers and family day care homes are allocated to family day care on the basis of the share of enrollment relative to total center and family day care enrollment.

TABLE IV

FAMILY DAY CARE HOMES

	Per Day Enrolled			Per Day Attended			Per Year Enrolled		
	First year	Second year	Third year	First year	Second year	Third year	First year	Second year	Third year
Ga.	$12.49	NA	NA	$13.72	NA	NA	$3,123	NA	NA
S.C.	6.07	8.23	6.75	6.37	9.24	7.61	1,518	2,108	1,688
Tenn.	7.07	6.61	7.78	9.49	7.84	8.88	1,768	1,653	1,945

In South Carolina and Tennessee, family day care cost $1,688 and $1,945 per year respectively, while center care cost $3,570 and $2,473. And these family day care costs included allocations for system-wide functions. Thus family day care consistently cost less than center care.

Family day care appears to offer a sound, significant service. The setting and format of the service differ from that of center care, but the two services can augment and enhance each other and their coexistence offers important choices for day care users.

The centers: Of the seven center locations, four were in the inner-city or urban areas. One of these was in a public housing project. These centers all proved to be convenient to a constant stream of day care users. In three cities most of the children could easily walk to the centers from

00033

their homes (mostly apartments) in the neighborhood. After-school day care, however, was severely disrupted when busing to achieve racial balance was instituted in the public school system. This meant that children were no longer in the neighborhood schools from which they could be picked up by the center as a group, but were scattered over a number of schools, some far away. Several terminations occurred because of the busing scheduling problems.

In the three centers in smaller towns, the location of the center was such that enrollment was difficult without transportation. The eligible population is not densely concentrated in small towns, but tends to be scattered. When a center is limited to serving only welfare families, a large radius of service is involved. This requires transportation, which is costly.

It might be expected that a location near a large center employing women who presumably need child care would attract enrollment that could be served without special transportation. The mother could bring her child with her and drop him off on her way. In practice this did not work out. The constraints on eligibility in terms of income and age range set by the federal regulations were usually too limiting to draw enough clientele just because a large employment center for women existed nearby.

The SDCP centers were housed in a variety of buildings. Institutional settings included a church's educational building and a vacant school. Prefabricated units were used to expand space for two programs—one housed in a converted store and one in a former residence. Public housing residential units were combined and converted for day care use in another program. Conversion of single family residences for day care has some advantages because of the spacious yards and the homelike atmosphere. Yet the cut-up interior of residences may hinder freedom to arrange space for groups of more than seven or eight children.

Although institutional buildings may be more likely to have doors that open outwards, vented hoods and other typical safety code requirements, they may not lend themselves to a cozy and homelike atmosphere for young children. Leasing a prefabricated mobile unit is a great advantage in quickly expanding space without major construction expenditures, if someone can be found who will purchase the unit.

How Much Does Day Care Cost?

The SDCP defined in great detail what is meant by cost. Operating expenses included salaries and all expenditures for recurring goods and services. In addition, there are nonrecurring expenditures for items that last, or that only need replacement at infrequent intervals. When the nonrecurring expenditures are added to operating expenditures, the result is total expenditures. Donated goods and services that help a program function must also be considered. If they are necessary to the operation of the program, they too must be "costed" to produce total costs (operating costs plus donated service costs).

00034

Costs are calculated by dividing total expenditures according to certain arbitrary units. Costs can be quoted in various units—per child day enrolled, per child day attended, per child year enrolled, etc. Before comparing program costs, it is important to check that all the costs refer to the same unit of measure. The costs quoted below are per child year enrolled. For each type of cost shown, the range is given from the lowest to the highest in the seven SDCP programs monitored by the project. The project lasted three full years, and costs are given for each of the three years.

The third year costs were always lower than the first year costs. Stocking up on the many necessary items at the beginning, plus low enrollments relative to staff as centers first opened, meant high unit costs initially. The highest costs in each instance were those of the infant programs. The ratios of staff to children were much higher for infants and therefore raised program costs. Among the programs not serving mostly infants, there were still considerable variations in costs. Many of the variations reflected differences in managerial ability, and in the administrative overhead.

From a subjective viewpoint, the program with the lowest operating costs ($2,047 the third year) appeared to have as good a program as any center in the group.

The difference in start-up costs ($189 to $826 per child) reflected the tremendous variation in physical setups that were initially available. The lowest start-up cost was for a program that was a continuation and upgrading of one previously in existence.

A difference of 10 to 12 percent was found in per child day enrolled and per child day attended costs. This reflected the high absenteeism rate for young children in day care. If programs had been staffed according to average attendance instead of enrollment, they could have cut staff costs by 15 percent. Since staff represents the single largest expense of day care, such a policy makes a significant saving.

There were also considerable differences in costs for functional classifications such as transportation, building maintenance, and social services. Some of these differences reflected variations such as whether or not cildren were transported by the center vehicle or by their parents. Others represented differences in "donated" services.

Differences in the percentage for management and administration ranging from 11 to 30 percent of total program costs reflected the higher costs when programs were operated by third parties, who added "overhead," "indirect costs" or "profit" to other expenses. (See Table V, Costs of Day Care, page 30.)

09035

TABLE V
COSTS OF DAY CARE

Centers	Low	High
Per Child Enrolled Annual Total Costs		
First Year	$2,525	$9,380
Second Year	1,775	4,365
Third Year	2,125	4,659
Per Child Enrolled Annual Operating Costs		
First Year	2,398	7,183
Second Year	1,740	4,358
Third Year	2,047	4,657
Per Child Enrolled Annual Operating Costs Including Donated Items		
Third Year	2,136	4,775
Per Child Start-Up Costs (Equipment)	189	826
Percent of Total Operating Costs by Categories (Third Year)		
Functional Classifications		
Administrative-Management	11%	30%
Child Care	40	60
Food	8	18
Health	0	3
Plant-Maintenance	4	11
Social Services	0	19
Special Functions	1	9
Transportation	0	7
Line Item Classifications		
Payrolls	62	89
Nonpayroll	38	11

00036

PART III

OVERALL ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS OF THE PROJECT

Consortium Meetings

Several planning meetings were held at the beginning of the project to develop the administrative and fiscal aspects of the project. All meetings included concern for developing the specific day care programs in the individual states. The Consortium of Child Welfare Directors acted as a planning and advisory committee to the project in the early months, but individual members also took back a great deal of information and thoughtful suggestions from the other members as they returned to develop their own state plans.

An early workshop brought together a number of child development experts from throughout the region and the nation to advise the staff and the state leaders on various aspects of quality day care. Another especially helpful workshop brought together a number of parents from throughout the region who were recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and who were potential users of day care, to advise on what parents wanted from day care for their children and for themselves. The results from these meetings, plus readings from the literature and meeting with special consultants, provided the inputs for the overall project's philosophies and objectives. These meetings also provided input for the individual state programs in setting their policies and procedures as they developed their Section 1115 day care program proposals.

As the programs in the states moved into their operational phases in the summer and fall of 1970, the meetings of the Consortium became more concerned with sharing progress reports and solutions to operating problems such as how to simplify purchasing or how to work with Merit systems in getting appropriate job descriptions and Merit examinations. The Consortium continued to advise the project on specific areas of program need such as family day care and school age day care, and reviewed and modified the objectives and the specific measures of outcomes as they were developed by the staff. There have been 12 meetings of the Consortium from its original organization in 1969.

A benefit which Consortium members and staff received from these meetings was the opportunity to meet fairly frequently with representatives from the Social and Rehabilitation Service and the Office of Child Development to learn firsthand of new policies and plans being developed in Washington that would affect day care and other child welfare programs in the states. The representatives from Kentucky and North Carolina received an extra bonus since these two states had only recently been moved from Region III of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare into Region IV. The Consortium meetings gave them a chance to get better acquainted with the staff persons in the Atlanta regional office as well as with their colleagues in the other six Southeastern states.

09037

Workshops for Day Care Program Directors and Staff

As the individual day care programs came into operation, there was need for training and problem-solving workshops for new levels of workers, especially the directors of the individual day care programs. The directors and some of their staffs were major participants in several workshops on such topics as "Family Day Care," "School Age Day Care," and "Licensing of Day Care." Other meetings of the program directors were concerned with operational problems such as those that also concerned the Consortium. The day care program directors were also involved in the design and use of the evaluation instruments, and a fair amount of their meeting time went to this subject.

There were also two workshops for the social workers who were either employed by or closely related to the individual day care programs. These sessions concerned overall roles and relationships of social workers in the day care programs as well as their specific roles in the evaluation process.

Consultation Visits

The staff, especially the project director, did a great deal of on-site visitation to the individual states to provide technical assistance and consultation to the individual day care programs in their development and operation. Sometimes these visits provided formal staff training sessions,but more often they were discussions of progress, problems and plans for overcoming problems. The training and evaluation staff persons also made consultation visits of this kind. Altogether it is estimated that 300 such consultation visits were conducted by the staff.

Studies and Reports

The SDCP made several studies and analyses of specific aspects of day care. Some of these studies were written up in "bulletins"—short publications given wide and timely distribution to concerned persons throughout the region. Among these were:

"A Cost Analysis System for Day Care Programs." The functional breakdown of costs met a need for systematic accounting in day care. This bulletin has been reprinted by the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.

"Southeastern Day Care Project Rating Forms." This bulletin describes the development of the forms, their uso and outcomes on them over the first two years of the project. Reliability and validity were explored, and revisions to the forms were devised.

00038

Training Activities

In the training area, the project's activities consisted of an analysis of the job activities for various levels of day care workers and an attempt to define the core of competence upon which to more accurately base the training programs for day care workers. This work has not been entirely completed. In large measure it has been taken over by the training materials for the training of Child Development Associates sponsored by the Office of Child Development.

Other activities in training were gathering and compiling data on all of the child care and child development training programs in the region.

Child development training program directors from a wide range of training programs (from high school level through technical schools and junior colleges to baccalaureate and masters level programs) were convened to explore just what was included in their curricula and to determine what information specific to day care they felt should be included in their child development courses. It was surprising to find how little content material was ordinarily included in the courses about the organization and delivery of services compared to the amount of material concerned with individual child development and learning theory. This service system information remains an unmet need.

Major Publications

In the course of the SDCP, several publications were developed to meet specific needs. They have been given wide distribution throughout the region and the nation. They are:

The Southeastern Day Care Project: Its Philosophy and Objectives. (1970). This publication has found rather wide appeal since there seemed to be no generally agreed upon statement of day care objectives as comprehensive and yet as detailed as this. The project has distributed 2,000 copies of this publication.

Day Care Is... (1972). This is a popularized and illustrated version of the philosophy and objectives for day care. It was written for more general public use among day care staffs, board members, parents, community agencies, etc. It has proved to be an extremely popular publication; it creates wider understanding of just what day care tried to do beyond basic care and cognitive development of children. Three thousand three hundred copies have been distributed.

Planning Playgrounds for Day Care. (1973). This publication describes some of the experiences and considerations in planning the arrangement, equipment, surfaces, etc., for playgrounds in day care programs. It describes a community-built playground, a child-built playground, and a playground planned and built by a commercial supplier. This book has been distributed to 600 persons.

00039

Evaluating Children's Progress. (1973). This publication describes the forms used by the SDCP and how to use them to assess child development. It is a recent publication that has had wide appeal to academicians and others who have a special concern for measurement and evaluation. The book contains a blank set of the forms which can be duplicated for use. It is being used by the Regional Head Start Programs. It has been sent to 700 persons.

How to do Day Care: Some Shared Experiences. (1973). This book recounts some of the specific considerations and pointers in planning and operating day care programs that the program staff learned in the various experiences in the SDCP programs. This publication is available for distribution.

The Southeastern Day Care Project's Evaluation Report. (1975). This is a highly detailed final report of the project, approximately 265 pages long, with charts, tables and in-depth discussions of the findings.

Staff Reports

SDCP staff, with staff and parents from the eight states, gave presentations at many state and national conferences, including the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the Child Welfare League of America and the American Public Welfare Association Roundtable. Approximately 23 such presentations were given to describe the project or some aspect of the project's approaches or findings. The staff members were also frequently called on for consultation.

Even with the project officially ended, nearly every regional conference or training session includes a presentation from the Donner centers.

Results in the States

Part II of this publication describes the effects of day care programs on children, families and communities. However there was still another set of objectives for the overall SDCP. This was to provide the states with experience in the operation of day care programs, and to help them develop their policies and procedures for the time when the expansion in publicly-funded day care programs would come.

In the early phases of the project there was a rapid expansion of day care using both private funds and some state and local public funds to obtain 75 percent federal matching funds under the provision of Title IV-A. In fact, the states were making haste to contract for as many social service programs (such as day care) as possible before a ceiling might be set on the Title IV-A funds that were then open-ended. During the early phases of the project other possibilities for the expansion of day care were also under consideration. The Family Assistance Plan was expected to be implemented, which would mandate registration of welfare mothers for work and require day care services for their children. In addition,

00040

the Child Development Bill, which would have greatly expanded day care services, was under consideration in Congress.

As it turned out, there was, in fact, a ceiling set on the expansion of social services under Title IV-A, and the regulations were drawn much more stringently. The Family Assistance Plan did not materialize, and the Child Development Bill was vetoed by the President. Yet, in spite of all these setbacks, there was a considerable increase in day care, mostly in the form of third-party contracts and the purchase of care for eligible families.

The figures for the growth of day care programs and the numbers of children enrolled in them in the various states are quite impressive. The states had hoped to increase their staffs of day care consultants and licensing specialists. The figures reported by the states show considerable gains during the period covered by the SDCP. Some examples given in a project "wrap-up" conference in August, 1973, were: In Florida between 1970 and 1973, there was an expansion of day care openings under the Title IV-A programs from 0 to 5,700 children who were cared for in 112 group centers and 100 family day care homes. There were 28 contract groups, most of whom were responsible for several centers or homes. In fiscal year 1974, Florida planned to use $1,875,000 of state funds, which constituted doubling available day care funds. The state has a new day care licensing law. At the state office level the staff devoted to day care has grown from one supervisor, one assistant and two clerical workers to five professional persons (with three more positions approved), plus four clerical workers. Several other states report similar progress.

The SDCP was the first Title IV-A contract in several of the states. Kentucky has two departments of state government that are involved in Title IV-A programs for children: the Department of Economic Security which manages the funds, and the Department of Child Welfare which has program responsibility. The SDCP was the first contract program between the two departments. At present, the two departments are jointly receiving revenue sharing funds for child programs. The Department of Child Welfare is working up standards for school age day care and infant care as a result of the experience with the SDCP.

North Carolina also has a new day care licensing law which sets minimum standards for services, but also provides for higher standards ("AA license) for those who wish to be recognized for providing a higher level of care than that required for basic licensure ("A" license).

More of these changes are documented in Part IV of this publication. These increases, of course, are the result of many factors. The SDCP cannot claim credit for bringing them about, but it may have facilitated some of them as a result of the increased concern, commitment and knowledge created by the project's activities.

In several states the welfare department officials were able to establish various policies and procedures for day care as a result of sharing ideas and experiences through the project. For example, at

30041

the start of the project, Tennessee was probably the most experienced in the development of third-party contracts. The procedures already developed in Tennessee were readily adapted by a number of the other states as a result of discussion of them in a project workshop.

As another example, hiring paraprofessional workers was often difficult at the start of the project. Day care positions and Merit system examinations simply did not exist in many states. Workers had to be employed as homemakers, case workers or teacher aides. During the operation of the project, existing Merit system classifications were modified, and day care positions were created where none existed before. Also, Merit examinations have been specifically designed for these day care worker positions.

Purchasing procedure was another problem worked out in conjunction with participation in the project. Tennessee, Mississippi, South Carolina and Florida each developed a petty cash fund that had not existed before, from which small purchases could be made without going through the complicated process of formal bidding.

The breakdown costs developed by the project helped the states evaluate other contracts that were being funded and provided a cost comparison base. The analysis of costs was also helpful in arriving at costs for purchase of care. As a result, rates for purchase of both family day care and center day care were raised in North Carolina and South Carolina.

In several states the demonstration centers have become major training resources for persons who are planning or operating day care programs. Training is provided both by visitation and in formal training sessions. It is offered to staff persons of county-operated or private centers from which care is purchased and to key social service staff, county coordinators, and state and regional consultants. Some of the centers also provide practicum training for students in child development programs from technical schools, two-year community colleges and regular four-year colleges and universities.

Another expectation of the project was that ways would be found to continue the support and operation of the individual state programs after the Donner Foundation funds ended in June, 1973. The fact that at the end of the project's funding all of the individual state programs were continued is an indication that the states felt that these demonstrations were worthwhile. In most instances state funds were obtained to maintain the programs. In Alabama the program was absorbed into an Appalachian Regional Commission program that serves a broader age range. In Georgia, the contract with the private corporation was not continued, but the parents organized and obtained funding from the city and county to carry on the contract with the state, using Title IV-A funds. When the project ended, no staffs were without jobs and no families were without day care services because of the termination of the Donner funds.

The project has now come to an official close. Some funds remain which will be used for three major purposes: 1) to further disseminate the publications and reports of the project; 2) to continue some work with

00042

the Consortium of Child Welfare Directors for a short time in the future, and 3) to continue some sporadic conference activities that may be specifically indicated. One such needed activity is further development of family day care.

In retrospect it appears that the SDCP was timely in its conception and execution and enabled the Southern region to serve the needs of a substantial number of poor children and families with quality day care services. It did not accomplish all that it had hoped to accomplish, but the contributions were substantial.

09043

PART IV

THE STATES' REPORTS

Each of the states submitted a Section 1115 project proposal for its demonstration day care project, and described what it intended to accomplish. Each state has given a brief account of how it fulfilled those intentions and what was learned from the the project.

These are their accounts.

Alabama's Day Care Project

The contract with the University of Alabama to provide infant care was one of Alabama's first experiences in contracting for day care services. Prior to this time, day care had been purchased on an individual child-by-child basis.

Donner Foundation funds became available shortly after day care center standards for children under three were adopted by the Alabama State Board of Pensions and Security. Group day care for infants was relatively new in the Southeastern region, and a demonstration program was needed to test minimum standards and to attempt to determine if group care, in a high quality center, was detrimental to children in the under-three age group. Information which we had gathered, nationwide, on group infant day care was sparse and inconclusive.

All of the existing centers from which we received material were being operated under the auspices of, or in close cooperation with, a university. High cost factors were recognized in the beginning, but the expertise of the campus staff and well trained center staff reduced the risk to the children.

Initial problems encountered were lack of clear guidelines from HEW concerning purchase of services, and to complicate matters further, conflicting information was given from time to time.

The geographical separation of the University of Alabama and the State Department of Pensions and Security was also a problem in that it was a barrier to cooperative and coordinated efforts and later to consistent and extensive monitoring.

The experience of drawing up a contract resulted in a very positive intra- and interagency working relationship among the County Department of Pensions and Security, the State Department of Pensions and Security, and the University of Alabama. The responsibilities of all three agencies had to be defined to prevent overlapping, duplication and friction.

Through experience with this contract, it became evident that almost total agency involvement was required: legal service, financial management, field service, the Bureau of Family and Children's Services and

00044

the Division of Day Care and Child Development on the state level, and the local county department staff. Fiscal and administration staff of the University of Alabama was also involved, along with the Department of Human Development and Family Life, and the center director and staff. It was most difficult to keep communication channels open and current, and it was not always accomplished.

This experience confirmed our growing conviction that the Department needed a unit with responsibility for drawing up, implementing and supervising contractual situations. Such a unit has since been established, with responsibility for seeing that all conditions of the contract are met, including budgeting, expenditure and other aspects of accountability.

As the components of comprehensive child care became more clearly identified, care had to be exercised that the social worker who was attached to the Department of Pensions and Security staff and the center staff did not threaten each other when roles sometimes overlapped. This experience was later applicable in contractual situations with Appalachian monies.

The state's goals for the project were, generally speaking, realized. The staff of the model day care center gave a great deal of verbal reaction to ***Minimum Standards for Day Care Centers for Children Under Three.*** Examples of assistance given by the model day care center staff were: specific recommendations in the programmatic area, specific lists of equipment and supplies for the young child, suggestions relating to child management and sleeping and eating patterns. This consultation was used to advantage when standards were revised this year.

According to our and SREB's evaluation, infants in the center were not damaged. Our observation of the children reflected—more dramatically than reports—that these children did profit from their experience at the center. It is difficult to chart progress in areas such as friendliness, happiness and enjoyment of the environment. A number of developmental and environmental problems were recognized and handled.

The staff of this center was also extremely generous with knowledge and with time in conducting workshops and in arranging observations in the center. Consultants on the licensing staff profited from discussions with center staff.

It is regrettable that more written material was not developed because there was a great deal more to be shared than the submitted reports reflected.

The existence of this center made a positive and broad impact on services to the very young child in this state.

Florida's Day Care Project

Florida had never appropriated funds for the purchase of day care services until fiscal year 1972-73. However, the state's use of Title IV-A funds, which was stimulated by the Donner Foundation's donation to the state for the operation of the Pearson Center made this possible.

00045

The state appropriated $250,000 for fiscal year 1972-73 to be matched 50-50 with local funds and 75 percent federal funds to purchase day care for eligible children. For fiscal year 1973-74, $1,875,000 was appropriated, and for fiscal year 1973-74, $2,187,500 was appropriated.

As of October, 1974, Florida was using $12,191,259 for the purchase of day care for 10,402 children using state-appropriated, local and Title IV-A funds. The care is provided in family day care homes and in day care centers.

The State Division of Family Services feels that it is more feasible at this time to purchase day care services than to operate day care centers.

The Pearson Day Care Center will continue to be operated by the state, using state and federal funds. It will continue to be used as a demonstration center and will provide in-service training and an opportunity for observation.

The Division of Personnel has established day care positions within the Merit system. These include day care facility administrator, day care facility supervisor, day care group instructor, and day care aides. There have been very few changes of personnel at the center.

At the state level, the staff for the day care unit has grown from one supervisor, one assistant supervisor and two clerical workers to one supervisor, one assistant supervisor, seven consultants and four clerical workers.

Florida now has a statewide day care licensing law which will be implemented July 1, 1975. A Child Care Advisory Council and consultants are assisting the Division in drafting standards for the establishment and operation of child care facilities.

Georgia's Day Care Project

The state entered into a contract with an incorporated profit-making group to provide group day care for 40 children and family day care for 10 children.

The project's philosophy of day care, as well as the philosophy of day care for this program, has been implemented fully in many aspects of the program.

The dedication of the child care staff and the kind of care provided were valuable. There was very little turnover in staff, and the consistent care proved to be very beneficial to the children. Social services to children and families helped to strengthen family ties in many cases and helped families through a variety of ways to function better.

Work with parents by all staff, and particularly the director and social service staff, enabled parents to assume more responsibility for their children. At the end of the demonstration period, parents assumed responsibility for the continued operation of the program. The community became aware of the need for the services, and through their efforts, individuals, churches, industry, the city, the county, the state and the federal government have contributed to the continuation of the program in the community.

This program has strengths in many areas, although there were some objectives in the original proposal that were not accomplished in the area of family day care. There are many problems to be considered in developing this particular service. The biggest problem was securing adequate staff and adequate housing. Family day care was provided during a brief period of the contract but was discontinued before the end of the demonstration.

Recommendations: For states interested in purchasing day care from profit-making organizations, we would make the following recommendations. These recommendations will in most cases apply to nonprofit as well as to profit-making organizations.

1. The program proposal as well as the contract should clearly define what is expected of each party to the contract.

2. Interim goals should be established in many cases and the program monitored on a systematic and ongoing basis.

3. Some flexibility should be built into the contract so that adjustments can be made if original goals become unrealistic.

4. Staff responsibilities, both for the state agency and the contracting agency, should be clearly defined.

It is possible to purchase good services from profit-making organizations, but more safeguards must be built in to be sure that good services are delivered. Profit-making organizations have a different base of operations from the traditional nonprofit social service agency.

This program is being continued through the efforts of parents of the children using it. Near the end of the demonstration, the parents organized to serve as sponsor and raised sufficient local funds to match Title IV-A funds to expand and continue the program.

Kentucky's Mobile Day Care Project

The Kentucky Mobile Day Care Project began operation in July, 1970. Kentucky was the only state in the region to select a day care activity that was not the operation of a day care center through one method or another. Kentucky had previously experimented with the operation of two

00047

day care centers—one in a very rural area and one in a metrpolitan area. Based on these experiences, Kentucky had decided that day care would be more readily available to the children of the Commonwealth if local organizations and the private sector could be encouraged to accept the responsibility for providing day care. On this premise, Kentucky decided to direct its project toward three goals: 1) to promote the establishment of day care programs in selected areas where the need for and interest in day care was the greatest; 2) to provide training opportunities for interagency staff, and 3) to provide training opportunities for present and potential day care staff and other persons providing day care.

To work toward these goals, Kentucky purchased a motor coach, equipped it with day care equipment and supplies and staffed it with day care and publicity specialists to move from town to town for prearranged meetings and training sessions. Additional day care staff were employed and stationed in the eight areas of the state to work with the staff of the mobile unit when it was in their area and to provide necessary follow up when the mobile unit moved on.

The time the mobile unit spent in a community varied from two days to a full month. The day care staff in the field are still pursuing interest created by the mobile unit and many requests for return visits have been received and are being honored.

The usual plan of operation was: a request from field staff was sent to the project, the publicity specialist spent a week or two in the community contacting staff of a human services agency, civic clubs, public officials, school authorities, industries employing women, and the news media to obtain advance publicity as well as follow-up stories on the visit of the mobile unit. At the time the mobile unit arrived, it was on display and open to the public in a convenient place with at least one staff member present at all times to talk individually with the visitors. At least three meetings were held at each site—one for the general public, one for staff, and one for day care operators. Additional meetings were scheduled as the need indicated. The staff of the project, assisted by the day care staff in the community, presented program and training sessions. When the mobile unit moved on, the local day care staff was known to the community and began working with them to bring about the actual establishment of a day care program.

Accomplishments:

1. The full program of the mobile unit aimed at the three project goals was presented in 81 communities in 51 of the 120 counties.

2. The mobile unit was visited by 4,398 people who gained firsthand knowledge of the equipment necessary to carry out a day care program and an understanding of the program content of day care.

3. A total of 401 meetings were held with a total attendance of 7,442.

00048

4. State day care staff increased from a total of five at the beginning of the project to 25 at the end of the project. Plans are now being completed to add 10 more staff members to more effectively handle the interest created by the project.

5. At the beginning of the project there were 123 licensed day care facilities in the 49 rural counties visited by the mobile unit. At the end of the project this number had increased to 240, a 95.1 percent increase.

6. While the project concentrated on the rural areas of the state, programs were also conducted in the urban areas of Jefferson and Fayette counties. Jefferson County showed an increase from 155 licensed facilities at the beginning of the project to 196 at the end, while Fayette County increased from 40 to 57. However, because of several other efforts to increase day care spaces in these two counties, all of the increase cannot be contributed to this project.

7. This project was the beginning of Title IV-A service contracts in Kentucky, and it paved the way for additional contracts with other state agencies and the private sector.

8. A total of 625 interagency staff attended training sessions on needs of young children in-home and out-of-home, what constitutes good day care, why it is needed, how to evaluate child care arrangements, the importance of developing child care arrangements in the community and the role of the social worker in the development; requirements for licensing, requirements for purchase of care, available resources for day care and the use of day care as a child welfare resource.

9. Monthly in-house training sessions of one to two days were conducted for all state day care staff. They consisted of a session on early childhood development; a session on developing techniques to provide training and consultation to day care providers; sessions on health, safety, and good services programs; sessions with various state agencies concerning some aspect of day care and funding; and other topics of mutual interest. In addition, staff participated in training sessions sponsored by other organizations including a two-week session at Syracuse.

10. Workshops were developed and conducted for operators in the areas of a general program for preschoolers, block building, parent-teacher relations, music, creative activities, discipline and administration. These have been compiled for future use.

What We Learned:

1. The most effective way to get a group to listen to the needs of young children in day care is to be a part of a regularly scheduled meeting rather than to attempt to arrange a special meeting for this purpose.

00049

2. Title IV-A was not realistic in start-up costs for day care.

3. Title IV-A in Kentucky is strictly a reimbursement program and not even the donor's share can be used prior to the service rendered, even though we had a waiver on advanced payments.

4. From the initial promotion of day care, it takes a long time to actually get a facility started. We are still reaping results from the seeds sown by project staff.

5. A concentrated effort to develop family day care homes in four counties failed because of staff turnover and inability on the part of the community to see the advantage of licensed family day care. This effort did result in the establishment of two day care centers which the community could see. We also learned that family day care at the price people can pay is economically impractical.

6. Techniques for developing community interest were effective, and this was further substantiated in the 25 public forums we have held on revised standards and regulations.

7. We learned to work with public information systems and news media to sell an intangible product such as human services.

8. We learned that specially called town meetings were not effective because the person sent to represent his group had little interest except to report back to his club.

9. Citizens interested in working to promote day care were identified in every community visited, but lack of local funds often prevented action.

10. There has been a definite increase in publicly-operated day care centers—125 in 1970 to 275 in 1973.

11. Education of the general public as to the needs of young children is a continuous process.

12. Presentation at high schools, vocational schools, colleges and university classes is a good way to begin to educate future parents as well as interest students in working in day care programs.

13. The project provided content for the beginning development of a manual to be used in promoting day care, training social workers in the area of day care, and expanding the workshop manual that was developed for operators. Plans are to complete this manual.

14. Good day care is expensive, and some supplementation to the average working mother's fees must be made available if we are to have quality day care in small communities that do not have

00050

need for a center large enough to be economically feasible at the fees the parents can afford to pay.

15. Parents did not participate in programs planned for them unless they had children in a public center. We found that our greatest contact with parents was at meetings of civic groups and organizations in the community.

16. Much interest was shown when the mobile unit was on display at state and county fairs, organization meetings of day care committees, vocational schools, state welfare and Headstart conferences.

Mississippi's Day Care Project

The initial goals of the Donner Day Care Project and our evaluation of our effectiveness in attaining each goal was as follows:

1. To provide a needed service tc a group of children and families in Columbus.

   The day care center has served the maximum number of children the program was designed to serve since its first few weeks of operation. There has always been a waiting list for children in most age groups. Without doubt the program has provided a needed resource for children of low income welfare recipients and has been the only resource that was available for most of the children in the particular group.

2. To provide experience through which the Department of Public Welfare can learn what goes into community planning for day care, the problems inherent in operating a day care program, and the cost of care for children in different age groupings.

   We have learned what is involved in the development, establishment and operation of a day care center. We believe that the knowledge and experience gained from this endeavor will be of benefit should this agency decide to operate a day care program in the future. Particular areas of learning for us related to staffing, purchasing and administration.

3. To provide a quality program at realistic cost to be used as a demonstration center for the interpretation of good day care.

   Persons with expertise in the child development field who have visited and observed our Donner Project have commented that we have a quality program. We believe that our cost has been realistic and we have concluded that good day care is costly.

00051

4. To secure community involvement in planning for day care services, using all available resources.

   Success in the area of community involvement in planning for day care services has been limited and not all that was desired. We were more successful in utilizing community resources which included the county health department, Regional Mental Health, Golden Triangle Vocational School, Boy Scouts, Woman's Auxiliary from the Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus Junior Auxiliary, and the Young Women's Christian Association.

5. To provide a setting for training and staff development of center and agency day care staff.

   The day care center was used to provide training and staff development for the center staff. It was also used for learning observation by college students and by child care students at the vocational school on a planned basis. Because of the location of the day care center in the state and other factors, it was not possible to use the center for training and staff development for agency day care staff located elsewhere in the state.

6. To provide an opportunity for volunteers to become aware of day care needs, to be involved in child development program enrichment, and to seek community support in expanding day care services to additional children.

   We learned the advantage of being selective of volunteers for use in the program activities as well as the importance of careful planning and scheduling in the use of volunteers.

7. To demonstrate to industry and other groups interested in economic development the value of day care as a basic community service.

   Industry was well represented on the community day care advisory committee. We believe we made some progress in demonstrating to industry representatives that day care for children of employees can make for better employees.

8. To use all staff to begin to identify the level of skill which is required to perform specific tasks.

   The local university secured funding from the Appalachian Regional Commission for an infant day care program based on the model we had provided for activity of infants outside the crib. We found that it is not necessary to have a college degree person in the child caring role with infants and that necessary skills and tasks can be taught and learned.

99052

9. To involve parents in identifying the goals which day care can achieve for their child.

   Because social workers were not assigned to the day care center, we were limited in our ability to help parents identify the goals which day care might achieve for their child.

10. To work toward securing an additional day care facility which would provide a setting for observation and training of: 1) university and college students majoring in social work or child development; 2) other child care personnel.

Following one year of operation, we expanded the day care center to care for 45 children, including infants. However, we were never able to develop the kind of setting for observation and training we had envisioned.

The Donner Day Care Center did have positive influence upon the local university developing a day care program similar to the design of our program and securing funds for its operation. It has continued to be an excellent resource and a sole resource for low income children served by the county welfare department.

North Carolina's Day Care Project

The state agency had three major objectives for its Donner Project:

1. To develop a comprehensive day care services program at the county level and to demonstrate the program to other county departments.

2. To experiment with methods for creating approved resources and for delivery of services which are not possible currently under the State Plan, i.e., funds for start-up costs and upgrading a variety of facilities for agency-supervised as opposed to agency-operated day care facilities; development of innovative hours of care such as overnight, emergency, Monday through Friday care, after school care; development of programs for children with special needs (infants, handicapped, retarded) or other kinds of programs requested but not yet available in most communities.

3. To develop a training component for statewide use, to be expanded during the second and third years of the project. Emphasis was to be placed upon establishment of a training site during the first year and upon a training program for staff with varied skills and responsibilities who will serve varied needs of children. This training model would demonstrate collaborative community efforts in delivery of services, hopefully to be implemented in other areas of the state.

Two pilot counties were selected for the demonstration—urban Cumberland County (Fayetteville) and rural Union County (Monroe). Cumberland county also had a military installation, Fort Bragg, which created a variety of needs and problems in service delivery. Experiences from these counties would prove invaluable in statewide day care development and training programs.

As a Social Security Act 1115 Section demonstration project, North Carolina's project was designed to encourage the state and counties to explore and experiment with fresh and original methods of promoting comprehensive day care services. Provision was made for waivers of compliance with state plan requirements in order to carry out these objectives. While it had considerable potential for expanding and upgrading resources, six waivers were necessary to carry out these methods. (Securing regional HEW approval for these waivers created a seven-month delay in the project's full implementation.) The waivers were: 1) "statewideness," and permission to use funds in; 2) supporting a three-year contract for the project director (the first time the state agency had ventured into contracts for professional services); 3) providing funds to the counties to be expended for upgrading and start-up equipment for carefully selected facilities; 4) purchasing equipment for agency-supervised facilities which would remain the property of county departments of social services; 5) making minor renovations or additions to a physical plant which would house a county-operated day care program, enabling it to be converted into a training site for use throughout the county and state; and 6) making advance payments to SREB in support of the contract for coordinating, evaluating and providing training consultation to the project.

These were extraordinarily ambitious objectives for a three-year project which had a staff of only five and two secretary/bookkeepers at its peak level. Due to limited project staffing, full utilization of other supportive staffs at state and county levels was planned. But these staffs were frequently unavailable, and project staff's energies and time were consumed with other related functions in the development of the local day care programs. Also the state agency was just beginning to utilize Title IV-A and B funds for purchase or direct operation of services. The state agency needed to try out the above new concepts and to gain experience in developing its purchasing, budgetary, accounting, monitoring and contractual procedures before expanding into services on a statewide scale.

Meeting these objectives in accordance with this timetable was impossible because of a number of constraints, including the seven-month delay in project approval. In addition, massive reorganization at the state and regional levels was occurring, with all of the concomitant adjustments. There were delays related to complex purchasing and contractual procedures, construction and renovation delays, and delays in delivery of equipment, furnishings, materials, etc. Despite the constraints and delays, the project succeeded in:

1. Laying the foundation for a comprehensive delivery system in each of the counties, which are not serving as statewide demonstration/observation/training sites. Cumberland County moved from having only two provisionally approved purchase facilities

00054

in July, 1970 (serving 105 children in the two- to eight-year range) to 432 approved spaces for children in the two-month to 14-year range by July, 1974. Union County increased its spaces in the same period from 35 (two- to six-year range) to 188 spaces serving two-month to 14-year-olds.

2. Experimenting with various methods for creating a variety of new resources and services. Funds were used to purchase and deploy equipment to five agency-subsidized church and community-sponsored purchase facilities in Cumberland County and two in Union County. An agency-supervised small group home serving no more than 12 children was experimented with in each county, but proved infeasible because of high cost per child and the low purchase rates— an invaluable piece of knowledge for statewide program planning. Although fair standards had been developed for small group homes, there was no experience with their implementation.

   Similar problems were encountered in development of agency-operated small group homes and family day care homes. These were quickly eliminated from the project as too expensive. Four agency-supervised family day care homes serving no more than five children were developed in Cumberland and some are now in the process of development with project funds in Union County. These are less costly than small agency-operated programs. Also it is difficult for the local agency to operate a program in a private home. It was thought possible to develop these resources as satellites of a larger center, especially in housing project areas, but the Housing Authority objected to leasing housing for this purpose or allowing their tenants to operate such a program.

   Innovative hours of care were possible in only one agency-supervised small center in Fayetteville. There have been no demands for such care in rural Union County thus far. With the increased demand in other urban areas, however, these experiences will prove useful. Programs for children with special needs were developed in both counties and incorporated into regular facilities so that infants did not have to be "aged out," and the handicapped were not set apart and stigmatized.

3. Developing training sites in each county for statewide use through close collaboration with county staff in the design of the two county-operated facilities and in establishing their potential for statewide training. Although considerable training, consultation and technical assistance were provided at the local level in each county, the project was unable to create a training component for statewide use until the fourth year. The unexpended project funds are being used in these efforts.

The state agency incorporated the training component into its regular State Day Care Services Program in July, 1973, with a state appropriation providing the state and local share which had been provided

00055

previously by the Donner Foundation. During the fourth year extension, 3,146 personnel from 83 counties attended training sessions offered by the project. Project staff is collaborating with the high schools, community colleges, technical schools and universities in developing their child care, child development and early childhood education curricula.

Although the direct impact of the project on the total day care services delivery system in the state would be difficult to measure, it did carry a major role in determining the actual costs of care and increasing the purchase program rates to a more realistic level based upon the findings. This change encouraged an increase in resources and reduced their turnover rate. The state's program has grown from a $5-1/2 million appropriation for the 1969-70 biennium to a $4-1/2 million appropriation for FY 1974-75. There were only 63 approved facilities serving 375 children in July, 1970, versus 384 certified facilities serving 10,615 children in July, 1974. The number of counties purchasing or providing day care services has grown from 59 to 69 of the state's 100 counties in this period. Nineteen county departments are now operating facilities, versus two at the project's outset.

Conculsion:

1. Special subsidy of facilities can succeed only if accompanied by technical assistance, consultation and training by competent, experienced personnel. This combination can succeed rapidly in creating and upgrading a variety of public and private resources with a high return on a minimal investment of funds.

2. A strong sociopsychological support system such as that provided through the project is essential to all levels of day care personnel in their difficult and demanding work.

3. A multidisciplinary team approach is essential to the development and maintenance of a comprehensive delivery system.

4. A number of small facilities scattered throughout the community is preferable to a few large centers serving more than 75 children. The smaller, readily accessible facility is probably more economical over time, as less money is required for transportation. But the large center may have the advantages of caring for siblings at one site and providing more specialized services.

5. Personnel of various educational backgrounds have expressed the desire to improve their competencies. They eagerly take advantage of relevant training programs when training sessions are held at low activity times at the site or on evenings and weekends.

6. Training staffs must keep abreast of the latest knowledge and methods in child development, and should be given opportunities to enhance their competencies as trainers in a rapidly expanding and changing field.

00056

7. Every effort must be made to develop well-designed, economically sensible programs if we are to meet the growing need for day care resources. Program developers, including those who design and construct buildings and equipment as well as administrators and educators must be trained to value cost effectiveness. To curtail costs through poorly conceived staffing patterns or the quality of staff is shortsighted, indeed.

South Carolina's Day Care Project

With the expiration of Donner Foundation funds in July, 1973, the responsibility for providing matching funds for the South Carolina Demonstration Day Care Project was assumed by the Division of Children and Family Services in the State Department of Social Services. During the 16 months from July, 1973, through October, 1974, the project has experienced growth in many areas. There has been an increase in enrollment from 70 children in July, 1973, to 231 children as of November, 1974. With the addition of two more centers serving 162 children, the project staff has more than doubled.

In January, 1974, administrative changes in the State Department of Social Services necessitated moving sponsorship of the project from the Division of Children and Family Services to the Office of Child Development. This change has increased the provision of readily available resources and expertise which has been a tremendous boon to staff training and child care services.

The sections which follow review the original objectives of the South Carolina project, illustrate ways in which project staff believes these goals were met and highlight some of the more significant learnings from the project.

Original Objectives or Goals:

1. To demonstrate that day care for children means not only close supervision but a planned daily program of activities and experiences to meet the child's educational, emotional, social and physical needs

2. To improve the quality of family life and enhance employment capabilities

3. To implement as many types of child care in the community as needed and as possible in order to learn which are economically, physically and socially feasible and desirable in low income neighborhoods

4. To lessen child neglect and abuse through the creative use of day care

00057

5. To demonstrate the importance of quality day care in order to sell first class programs to legislators, low income community, involved agencies and the general public

6. To provide an observation and training center where county day care staff and other appropriate persons can be trained in the basics of child development and the ways in which children's needs can be met in good day care centers and family homes.

Project Goal Responses:

To Goals 1, 2, 3 and 4:

In looking at the original goals of the project and the extent to which they have been accomplished it is most meaningful and significant to the present director that the effort and work of past and present staff has provided the mechanism through which quality child care has been provided to many children and families in the greater Columbia area. Without this mechanism and work toward these goals, the project could not have grown to its present size.

The following are examples of the first four goals:

A boy, age 3, and his mother live in the Hendley Homes Housing Development, where the boy was placed in the day care center in 1971. He was hyperactive and experienced many adjustment problems. Health screening revealed that he had a hearing problem. The social worker and center staff worked with the mother to have the boy's problem corrected through surgery. The boy subsequently adjusted much better into center routine and the mother participated in conferences concerning his progress and readiness for the public school kindergarten program. The mother continues to work but is not able to entirely accept her son's immaturity and need for further developmental experiences.

In another case, a mother was in job training at Midlands Technical Education Center. She and her three children, a nine-month-old infant, a girl 3 years old and a boy 4 years old, were receiving public assistance and living in the Hendley Homes area. The project provided day care for the older children at the Hendley Homes Center and for the baby in Mrs. Murray's family day care home. The mother was able to continue and eventually complete her training as a laboratory technician. During the spring of 1974, the project social worker placed all three children in temporary foster care for a period of three days, when the mother had to undergo minor surgery and brief hospitalization. Later the baby contracted a parasite which caused diarrhea and high fever. The mother turned to the project social worker for help when the doctor recommended a ten-day period of isolation. By this time the mother had moved and obtained a new job, but was still a potential AFDC recipient. The project was able to pay a caregiver during this ten-day period.

00058

The mother has been separated from her husband, a former mental patient, for over a year, but he has persistently bothered and tormented the family through malicious destruction of family possessions while the mother was at work or in training. The project social worker has offered support during court battles over custody of the children.

In another example, a girl, age 7, had been enrolled in the Gonzales Garden Day Care Center for approximately two years. Observant project social workers and staff became aware that the girl was retarded in language and motor skills. Further investigation revealed that she was enrolled on a half-day basis in the Urban League Program for Exceptional Children. Psychological testing there revealed that she was trainable and needed specialized care. The mother works, but project social workers were able to get some medical and food assistance for her three children. Social service counseling with the mother enabled her to accept the girl's need for specialized care and she is now enrolled in Happy Time Center for mentally retarded children.

To Goal 5:

Local funds, including revenue sharing monies, have continued to add to the support of the project. For example, in the current project budget, the following funding is reflected: Revenue sharing—$50,000; Columbia Day Care Project, Inc.—$24,500; Richland County Funds—$ 4,000. Project development and growth has entailed the cooperative efforts of community churches, the Columbia Housing Authority and city and county officials.

To Goal 6:

Over the years of its operation, the project has functioned as a training base for many different groups:

1. The center and day care homes in the Hendley Homes area served as an observation center for county workers carrying special opportunity for licensing. Both supervisory and line staff participated in the three sessions scheduled. The county staff was especially appreciative of the opportunity to see a program in action and to discuss objectives and activities with staff. During the past year, in-service training could not be open to county staff because of the limited size of the project staff and the director's efforts to gear it to the particular needs of immediate staff. However, as the training resources and staff over the state can be coordinated through the Office of Child Development, the project, because of its growth and expansion, can provide more varied observational and demonstration opportunities not only for Social Service and Child Development staffs, but for operators of day care facilities as well.

00059

2. The project has served as a training base for local universities and colleges since its beginning. Graduate and undergraduate students in early childhood education and psychology from the University of South Carolina, students enrolled in the child development associate program at Allen University, and students in elementary education from Benedict College have been scheduled for practicum experiences at the four centers.

3. Other projects over the state used the project to get ideas and direction in their beginning stages.

Other Significant Learnings:

1. Start-up operations pointed to unrealistic licensing regulations for family day care homes. As a result, staff of the State Department of Social Services, working with the Task Force on Child Care Licensing, are now developing more realistic regulations for the smaller day care facilities. These regulations will be operative by 1975.

2. Merit system of the state has no job classifications relating to day care positions, and Merit examinations tend to be entirely irrelevant for day care staff. So far no progress has been made in this area.

3. Observational aspect of training was especially valuable to those participating. However, project was not readily accessible to some of the remote areas of the state. Training staff of the Office of Child Development is considering using other direct operations over the state as observation areas when programs can be upgraded adequately.

4. The day care system composed of centers with satellite day care homes made available alternative types of day care which offered flexibility in placement of children. (For example, older preschool children who had some emotional problems gained stability from temporary placement in family day care homes.) The Office of Child Development, which is the unit in the State Department of Social Services with responsibility for day care, is working now to establish more such systems over the state.

5. Costs per child tended to be too high when project enrollment was 50 or below. Now that the project is serving 231 children, costs are more realistic.

6. Administrative structure must allow for day care staff to have ready access to persons supervising the immediate program. In this project, centers are located in four remote areas of the city. Strong center directors who can work directly with the immediate staff of each center has proved to be a workable

00060

pattern in a situation where the overall project director cannot maintain close contact with all staff on a daily basis.

7. Current training events designed for social workers are not adequate for the role of the worker in day care. State Child Development Unit should work with State Staff Development Unit in redesigning training for the social worker who carries responsibility for day care.

8. Staff persons with two-year or four-year degrees in early childhood education were not necessarily adequate in the day care situation. Several of the colleges and universities offering such degrees in South Carolina are now designing special courses focusing on some of the unique aspects of day care.

9. The project gave the Department its first experience in utilizing Title IV-A funds for day care. From this experience, the Department gained the necessary expertise to enable it to move into other operations. It now funds 60 operations with varying kinds of funding source mixes. In 1970, the Department, through the South Carolina Day Care Project, was serving approximately 50 children. In 1974, the Department is serving approximately 6,000 children through purchase of service contracts or direct operation.

10. The project provided direction to the Department as to how to set up and maintain direct operations. Through this initial experience, the Department isolated and resolved problems relating to classifying and recruiting personnel, budgeting and the designing of a viable reimbursement mechanism.

11. The project demonstrated that the paraprofessional who is provided with adequate supervision and in-service training can be very effective in working with young children. As a result, the project now has a larger proportion of paraprofessionals working under the supervision of trained professionals.

Tennessee's Day Care Project

The purpose of the Donner-Belmont Child Care Project was to provide the Department of Public Welfare actual experience in operating a child care program and to demonstrate the effectiveness of a comprehensive child care service. It planned to do this by providing day care in a center for children over three years of age and by developing satellite family day home care for children under three and for those with special needs. It also hoped to demonstrate the effectiveness of casework services, a strong volunteer program, community involvement, parent participation, and use of community resources.

From our experience in operating a day care program, we developed procedures, standards and priorities for statewide day care programs,

00061

evaluated various aspects of the day care program in terms of impact on children, families, communities, etc., relative to costs and manpower requirements. The project gave staff experience and knowledge to help them work more effectively with other day care programs throughout the state.

Tennessee's evaluation of its Donner Project experience follows:

To provide the Department of Public Welfare experience in operating a comprehensive child care program:

The Department of Public Welfare has gained a great deal of valuable experience in actually operating a comprehensive child care program. This experience has proved beneficial in helping licensing counselors to be more understanding of day care operators' problems in meeting minimum requirements and desirable standards. It was learned that the meeting of these standards and requirements is directly related to the cost of child care. A comprehensive child care program is expensive, but we believe comprehensiveness is an essential element in enhancing the growth and development of many children who would not otherwise receive this experience. Funds invested in meeting these basic needs of children in their foundational years increase the possibility that the children served will be able to attain a self-satisfying and productive life.

The experience of actually operating a comprehensive day care program made the Department aware of the desire of private day care staff for opportunities to better equip themselves to care for children and that the state, through operating a comprehensive child care program, can meet this need to some extent. The Donner-Belmont program is presently making a concerted effort to offer training to as many day care staff as possible. We have trained the center's staff as training persons in their own areas of competence and have budgeted for the expense of having persons come to the center for training, and for the center's staff to travel to other agencies. The spin-off from this direct training of day care personnel has been that other systems have become aware of the need for training in day care, i.e., church boards, colleges and civic organizations. We have found that the demonstration center is a viable means of offering this kind of orientation to day care.

We have learned that employment of staff through the state personnel office and Merit system presents a problem in the center's operation. The problem of purchasing through the state purchasing system is cumbersome and at times difficult to deal with. Tennessee was able to work through these problems to some extent. However, any state contemplating operating a day care program should anticipate these difficulties in the beginning and make the necessary arrangements.

In addition to gaining experience in actually operating a child care center, perhaps the most important thing we learned is that a private foundation, the federal government, a state agency and a church could pool resources to develop and operate a child care program. Variations

of this arrangement could have a definite significance in the development and improvement of day care resources across the state.

Effectiveness of a comprehensive child care service:

We feel that this goal of serving the child care needs of the total family has been met in our program. We have expanded the thinking of many Tennesseeans interested in day care to include children above age six and below age three. We have developed a model for school age day care that has received national attention and is being studied by many communities in our state with the prospect of implementation. Our experience in serving children as they progressed in their development through the use of family day care homes, preschool program and school age program has emphasized the value of continuity in serving the child and his family.

We have learned that family day care costs as much if not more than center care if the same quality care is provided in both settings. Even with a very strong support system such as that offered by the center staff, the family day home often does not provide the level of developmental care that is to be found in the center. This is true with regard to nutrition and cognitive development in particular. Nutrition in family day homes is a problem because USDA food reimbursements and supplements cannot be used in private homes under present USDA guidelines. The cognitive development problem is related, we believe, to the inadequate income of the family day home mother. The paraprofessional who is attracted by this present low income is likely to be untrained for any kind of child-related job other than baby-sitting. Given that her training must begin at very primary levels, it can be expected to move the family day home worker only very gradually into the concepts and practices of good cognitive development. This problem is compounded by the fact that the inadequate income often prompts the partially trained family day home mother to leave the program after a few months, and the training dollar and effort must begin at the base level again with a new person. What the rapid turnover in family day home workers does to the development of children served by the program can only be measured as negative. When his family day home mother leaves the program, the child must adjust to a totally new environment and a new relationship with a person who has a completely different set of expectations than the person who cared for him last week.

Casework services:

The Donner-Belmont program gave the Department the experience of having a caseworker as part of the day care center staff, stationed at the center and working as a member of the staff team. The caseworker at Donner-Belmont Center is responsible for all service work with the families, such as intake, referral and counseling. She also

is responsible for evaluating the five satellite family day care homes and offering consultation to them. We feel that there is an advantage for the caseworker to be a member of the center staff. The effectiveness of the program depends a great deal on how closely the staff works together with respect and understanding for each other's responsibility. As a part of the team, the caseworker has an opportunity to become familiar with the center operation, the program and the work of all the staff.

The teachers and caseworker share information about the family which helps all staff to better understand and accept the child and his family. We know that permanent improvement in the areas of the child's emotional, social, physican and intellectual development is generally unlikely unless there is some improvement in the family situation as well. The caseworker is experienced in assessing family needs and knows how to bring together various resources to assist the family. The caseworker's knowledge of human development and behavior is helpful in program planning and in helping staff with children's emotional problems.

Volunteers:

Donner-Belmont implemented its objective of a strong volunteer program. The purpose of this was to give enrichment and variety to children's experience in day care. By bringing additional talented people into the lives of children on a regular basis, some of the benefits of an extended family constellation (i.e., individuals of various ages, sex, personalities and experience) can be replicated. The continual education of community members on the role of day care in a period of rapid change in society's needs and styles has been promoted by providing firsthand experience for people in a quality child care facility. This mutuality of benefits heightens the possibility that communities will respond to the true needs of diverse members.

The complexity of coordinating and training volunteers to insure a comprehensive program as well as developing community relations necessitated that someone on the center staff have primary responsibility for the job. The acceptance of volunteer help by the regular staff as well as the training and development of volunteers in public relations requires a key person to handle this responsibility. In Tennessee, the volunteer and training person was salaried because of the statewide training function of the center. In providing consultation to other programs, we have suggested that a volunteer coordinator of volunteers might be used, or a percentage of several staff members' time might be designated to this task.

Community resources:

The comprehensiveness of the program was made possible at a manageable cost by enlisting the donated services of health and mental health

00064

personnel, educational consultants, advocacy groups, school systems, business, etc. The day care center has been able to develop a pivotal role in uniting a number of systems to cooperate in addressing concerns that make a significant difference in the quality of life of children and their families.

To demonstrate parent participation:

We faced the question of the amount of involvement and participation that might be expected from parents, who, by definition, are working parents. We believe that of all types of parent involvement possible in a day care setting, that which helps the parent focus on the needs and development of his own child is of primary importance. We used the initial interview as the time to set the expectation with the parent that she was not giving over the care of her child to the center staff but entering into a mutually supportive system with the day care staff for the benefit of her child.

The opportunities given parents in the center for personal growth have enhanced self-image, skills and competencies to the degree that not only the families served have developed, but the community itself has benefited.

Recommendations:

1. Any state considering operating a child care program should anticipate the difficulties in working through the state's Merit system and purchasing system, and make the necessary adjustments.

2. Churches or other organizations that have limited resources and desire to operate a day care program should explore the possibilities of pooling resources with other community groups.

3. The state licensing authority should have firsthand experience in operating a day care center in order to become more aware of the problems inherent in meeting licensing requirements.

4. We recommend that the state operate a demonstration day care center to serve as a resource for all day care personnel and as a facility to educate the public regarding quality day care.

5. A comprehensive day care service should be designed to meet the total child care needs of the family, including infants and school age children.

6. If an agency is contemplating offering child care in family day homes, it should consider that the cost of comprehensive care in family day homes is equal to or possibly exceeds the cost of the center care.

09065

7. Agencies without the financial resources to employ a coordinator of volunteers should make some provision for a key person in the center to assume this responsibility.

8. In order to insure that families are strengthened by having their children in day care, centers should actively seek ways to involve parents in the program.

9. Centers should make use of community resources to help meet the high cost of comprehensive day care. Day care centers should be seen as the initiators of coordination and sharing of services in their communities.

00066

APPENDIX

Staff of the Southern Regional Education Board's Southeastern Day Care Project:

Nancy Travis, Project Director

Eva C. Galambos, Associate Project Director for Evaluation

Samuel Wallace, Associate Project Director for Training

Becky Cheek, Project Assistant

Janet Smith, Project Assistant

Xenia Wiggins, Project Assistant

Effie Hughes, Project Secretary

Members of the Southeastern Day Care Project Consortium:

Louise Pittman, Director
Bureau of Family and Childrens' Services
State Department of Pensions and Security
64 North Union Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Estelle Brock, Supervisor
Day Care Unit
Division of Family Services
P.O. Box 2050
Jacksonville, Florida 32203

Claude Corry, Deputy Director
Division of Community Services
Department of Human Resources
447 State Office Building
47 Trinity Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Morris Priebatsch, Director
Family and Children's Services
State Department of Public Welfare
P.O. Box 4321, Fondren Station
Jackson, Mississippi 39216

Anne McMichaels, Consultant in Day Care
Children and Family Services
Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Louis O'Conner, Director
Division of Welfare Programs
State Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 2599
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Tommy Perkins, Executive Director
Community Services for Greater Chattanooga
322 High Street
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403

Margaret Hockensmith
Assistant Director of Community Services
Department of Child Welfare
403 Wapping Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

James Vaughn, Assistant Regional Representative for Community Services
Social and Rehabilitation Services
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
50 Seventh Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

00837

Day Care Consortium - continued

Rubye Benson
Specialist in Community Programs
for Children
Office of Child Development
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
50 Seventh Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Dave Beecher
Community Services Branch
Social and Rehabilitation
Services
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
50 Seventh Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Day Care Project Directors:

Anne McMichaels, Consultant in Day Care
Children and Family Services
Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Ruth Heuser, Director
Pearson Center
1314 West Union Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32209

Mozelle Core, Director
Donner Belmont Child Care Center
Belmont United Methodist Church
2007 Ackler Avenue
Nashville, Tennessee 37212

Carolyn Rosenkrans, Director
Day Care Center
Kentucky Department of Child Welfare
403 Wapping Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Doris Alexander, Director
Demonstration Day Care Project
State Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 2599
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Leola Jenkins Petty, Director
Bedford Pines Day Care Center
Atlanta, Georgia

Martha Gulledge
Program Coordinator
Family and Children's Service
State Department of Public
Welfare
P.O. Box 4321, Fondren Station
Jackson, Mississippi 39216

Shirley Payne
Supervisor of Day Care
University of Alabama
School of Home Economics
P.O. Box 2998
University, Alabama 35486

00068